Name Change Proposal from Ed.D. to Ph.D.
for the Doctoral Degree in Curriculum and Instruction

January 21, 2011

College of Education

Department of Curriculum, Culture,
and Educational Inquiry

1

Table of Contents

Signature Page

**Request to Change the Doctoral Degree in Curriculum and Instruction
from a Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) to a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)**

Florida Atlantic University   **July 1, 2011**
University Submitting Proposal   Proposed Implementation Date

Education   **Curriculum, Culture, and Educational Inquiry**
Name of College or School   Name of Department(s)

Curriculum and Instruction   **Doctor of Philosophy in Curriculum and Instruction**
Academic Specialty or Field   Complete Name of Degree

Signature of Department Chair	Date	Signature of Chair, COE Curriculum Subcommittee of the Graduate Programs Committee	Date
Signature of Chair, COE Graduate Programs Committee	Date	Signature of COE Dean	Date
Signature of Chair, FAU Graduate Programs Committee	Date	Signature of Chair, FAU Faculty Senate	Date
Signature of Dean, FAU Graduate College	Date	Signature of FAU Provost	Date

B.

Proposal Intent and Rationale

The intent of this proposal is to change the degree name of the doctoral program that is housed in the Department of Curriculum, Culture and Educational Inquiry (CCEI) in the College of Education, from an Ed.D. (Doctorate in Education) in Curriculum and Instruction, to a Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction. We have a program with a strong research base, demanding course work, and a faculty committed to work closely with students. In its current form, the Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction is already competitive with Ph.D. programs in comparable universities.

A primary impetus for this name change is the market reality within which the Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction currently competes, both nationally and in South Florida. While the Ed.D. historically enjoyed a high level of professional respect as a doctoral degree that successfully combined theory, research, and practitioner knowledge, this prestige is being diminished in today's market-driven educational context. There is a movement in the field to address the role of research at the doctoral level by clearly differentiating and clarifying programs defined as Ph.D., as opposed to Ed.D., in Colleges of Education.

According to some, the "multipurpose" Doctor of Education may no longer be appropriate or useful for the field, given the differentiation of career paths and areas of expertise (Guthrie, 2009). Shulman, Golde, Conklin Bueschel, and Garabedian (2006) summarized the proposed distinctions between the two degrees, noting that the Ph.D. degree should be perceived as a "full-time, research-intensive program," and the Ed.D. as a "3-year, part-time program with a practice emphasis" that would not include a dissertation (p. 25). Arthur Levine (2005), former President of the Carnegie Corporation, argued that the current Ed.D. should be re-tooled into a new professional master's degree, parallel in many ways to the MBA.

Our Ed.D. Program has always been geared toward educators who are equipped to be researchers and consummate professionals in educational settings. Our students conduct empirical research and write dissertations after completing course work and qualifying examinations consistent with Ph.D. programs around the country in Colleges of Education. In order to further underscore our commitment to research as an essential element, we are proposing only one change to our current program, by requiring an additional existing research course for all students, Advanced Qualitative Research (EDA 7416). Our request is intended to appropriately name the program for what it is and for how it has functioned in academic as well as professional arenas.

Our faculty and students are alarmed by the trend in national discussions of doctoral programs that frame the Ed.D. as a degree increasingly limited to educational practice, with a shrinking research requirement. In an effort to underscore our department's and college's emphasis on doctoral research, exemplified by required research courses and the completion of a doctoral dissertation where candidates generate original research that makes a contribution to their field, we seek approval for this proposed name change. We believe that this name change will make the doctorate in Curriculum and Instruction at Florida Atlantic University more appealing to students interested in serious scholarship and will enhance the stature of the program, college, and university.

C.

Proposal Statement

Discussed and Unanimously Approved by CCEI Faculty after a discussion and revisions on August 16, 2010:

1) To change the name of the CCEI doctoral program from an Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction to a Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction.

2) To add one course to the current Program of Study: Advanced Qualitative Research (EDA 7416). Otherwise, the program will remain the same.

3) After approval by the Board of Trustees, to effect a transition plan for current students as follows:

> a) All current students who have not yet submitted an application for Graduation have the option to request the newly named Ph.D. degree instead of the Ed.D. Interested students must submit a written request to the Department Chair. Form will be provided by the Department, posted on the website, and disseminated to current students and advisors. The Department Chair will work with the Graduate College to effect the change for eligible students.

> b) All current students who have not yet submitted an application for Graduation and who wish to graduate with the Ph.D. must take or have taken the Advanced Qualitative Research course (EDA 7416) in order to qualify for the newly-named Ph.D.

> c) Students who do not wish to graduate with the newly named Ph.D. degree will, pending the fulfillment of all requirements, graduate with the currently named Ed.D.

> d) No students who have already graduated and received the Ed.D. from CCEI or the Department of Teacher Education will be eligible for the newly-named degree.

4) All students newly admitted to the program in the academic year following approval will only be admitted to the newly named program, the Ph.D. The Ed.D. program will no longer by offered to new students and will be so named only for current students completing the degree who have not applied for the newly named Ph.D.

D.

Timeline for Development of the Proposal

<u>June 2010</u>

Given our commitment to the doctoral program, the idea of changing the degree name had been discussed for several years. Work on the actual proposal began in June of 2010. Drs. Burnaford and McLaughlin met with Dr. Valerie Bristor, Dean of the College of Education, who gave her support. Prior to the meeting, Dr. Bristor communicated with Dr. Alperin, Interim Provost, who confirmed the process. Drs. Burnaford and McLaughlin also communicated with Dr. Linda Webb, Chair of the COE Graduate Programs Curriculum Subcommittee and with Dr. Deborah Floyd, Chair of the COE Graduate Programs Committee, to inform them of our proposal for a name change for the degree.

<u>July 2010</u>

Drs. Burnaford and McLaughlin met with Dr. Pat Maslin-Ostrowski, who teaches Advanced Qualitative Research (EDA 7416), to discuss our desire to require the course in our doctoral program as part of a change to the title of Ph.D. Dr. Maslin-Ostrowski supported the idea of this course being a requirement for CCEI doctoral students, noting that many students already take the course as an elective.

Dr. Alperin, through Dr. Bristor, requested an *Abbreviated Need and Demand* report that would include a justification for why it was being proposed, information about the demand for such a program, current education trends, market information, and data on student interest in the idea.

<u>August 2010</u>

Dr. Burnaford sent a survey to all current doctoral students in the Curriculum and Instruction program, asking them to respond to the idea of changing the degree title. Forty-two students responded in 2 weeks' time; all were supportive of the name change.

The *Abbreviated Need and Demand* report was sent to Drs. Bristor, Alperin, and Rosson, and to the CCEI Department faculty. The proposal was discussed at the Department of Curriculum, Culture, and Educational Inquiry's Retreat. After minor clarifying revisions in the proposal's transition plan were suggested, the department faculty voted 15 for and 0 against to support the proposal.

At the request of Dr. Alperin, Drs. Burnaford and McLaughlin met with Graduate College Dean Barry Rosson and Associate Provost Norman Kaufman. Both Dr. Rosson and Dr. Kaufman supported the name change proposal and confirmed their approval of the document prior to consideration by the Board of Trustees, pending approval by the appropriate faculty committees.

After those meetings, we brought a proposal to the Department of Curriculum, Culture, and Educational Inquiry at the Fall Retreat on August 16, 2010. The faculty members fully discussed the proposal, offered ideas for revisions of language and inclusion of information, and unanimously agreed that the document should go forward in the normal university process for approval.

Dr. McLaughlin also communicated with Dean Anne Boykin from the College of Nursing, and learned that our request for a degree name change has precedent at Florida Atlantic University. In 2005-2006, the College of Nursing changed the name of its Doctor of Nursing Science degree to a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) in Nursing. Nursing followed the same approval process as we will:

- Approval by the department, and then by the College Graduate Programs Committee, the FAU Graduate Programs Committee, and the Faculty Senate

- Support by the Provost to present the proposal for a name change of the doctoral degree program to the Board of Trustees (BOT)

- Approval by the Committee on Academic and Student Affairs (CASA), and then the full BOT

E.

History of the Doctoral Degree in Curriculum and Instruction

The doctoral degree in Curriculum and Instruction has been in existence for 40 years. A detailed timeline of major changes in the program may be found in Appendix A. The program initially was approved to be implemented in the 1970-1971 academic year, as an *Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction*. There were not a specified number of credits in doctoral coursework (only the equivalent of 90 credits beyond the Bachelor's degree). Three research courses were required, along with a Qualifying Examination and a dissertation.

In 1985-86, the degree name was changed to *Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction – Elementary Education*. The research requirement was expanded to 12 credits and the supervised internship was removed from the program.

Twelve years later, in 1997, the program name was changed to *Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction* again. The first Curriculum and Instruction courses with an "EDG" prefix were developed, but none of today's core doctoral courses existed.

Then, in 2001, six new doctoral courses were approved. Four of them (EDG 6303, EDG 6414, EDG 7250, and EDG 7938) comprise the core courses in today's program. One course (EDG 7944) is an advanced course in research literature that students take just before their Qualifying Examination. The other course (EDG 7251) has been taught as an elective.

In 2005 there was some internal reconceptualization of the program coursework, so that students could understand clearly which courses should be taken earlier and which ones later in the program. We maintained the requirement of 4 doctoral research courses, with 2 other research courses as prerequisites for those courses.

Finally, in the Summer of 2007, the Department of Teacher Education divided into two departments. A new Department of Curriculum, Culture, and Educational Inquiry gained supervision of the doctoral program. Two of the doctoral core courses were updated, renamed, and approved by the Graduate Programs Committee and at the university level in Spring 2009: EDF 7758, Trends in Analyzing Instructional Practices, and EDF 7917, Instructional Policies and the Teaching Profession.

Over the last 40 years, there have been changes in the number of credits required, the name of the program, the organization of coursework, and the content of the core courses. Our aim now is to maintain high expectations of student work, constantly examine the quality and depth of the curriculum, and seek consistency and open communication in our advising. Doctoral Graduate Assistants send out a newsletter every semester, titled *DocData*, which offers valuable information to students. We hold a Graduate Colloquium every Fall, and conduct Dissertation Writing Workshops at least once a year. In the last 3 years, faculty in the Department of Curriculum, Culture, and Educational Inquiry have made a collective commitment to advise doctoral students, discuss program issues, analyze data associated with the program, and work across disciplinary lines to continually enhance the curriculum.

<div align="center">

F.

Overview of the Doctoral Program

</div>

Structure of the Doctoral Program

Altogether, the doctoral program is comprised of 12 core curriculum and instruction credits, 15 research credits, 24 area of specialization credits, and 15 dissertation credits. (See *Appendix B* for the complete Program Description, and *Appendix C* for syllabi from the core curriculum and instruction courses.) Course work in the doctoral program comes in two forms – *foundational* and *specialized*. *Foundational* courses provide students with a "big picture" view of curriculum, instruction, and research. This course work has two components – core curriculum and instruction (C&I) courses, and two research courses (three in the proposed change). *Specialized* course work electives build on what the students have learned in the core courses, and help them to succeed in the final two research courses, which focus primarily on writing a literature review and determining a dissertation study design. Specialized course work often includes one or more Directed Independent Study courses that are shaped around the student's dissertation topic.

Core Courses

Students take the core curriculum and instruction courses early in their program. During this time, they explore various areas of research in curriculum and instruction, and narrow their areas of interest.

• *Doctoral Seminar (EDG 7938)* is taken during the first or second semester in the program. In the course, students learn about the nature of research analysis and interpretation, and about the program requirements. They examine current research in order to understand the expectations and technical requirements for scholarly research, and begin to frame their ideas for an investigation. Students also interact with doctoral student peers, analyze dissertations, and interview faculty members.

• *Constructing Models of School Curriculum (EDG 7250)* gives students a historical and philosophical understanding of curriculum, and enables them to understand different ways to conceptualize and study curriculum.

• *Trends in Analyzing Instructional Practices (EDF 7758)* is taken as early as possible in the program, before EDF 7917 if possible. In this course, students examine research about instructional practices and analyze their own practice.

• *Instructional Policies and the Teaching Profession (EDF 7917*) moves students from thinking about what happens in their classroom or school, to what happens and what should be happening in education on a larger scale. The course focuses on instructional policy and professional development.

Research Courses

• *Advanced Statistics (EDG 7114)* provides students with an understanding of important statistical procedures and helps them to consider how to analyze data for their own studies.

• *Introduction to Qualitative Analysis (EDA 6415)* offers students a new way to think about research. In this course, students are guided through the design and implementation of a

qualitative research project. They learn about the research design, data collection methods, and data analysis methods used in qualitative research.

• *Advanced Qualitative Analysis (EDA 7416)* is a course in which students learn how to analyze qualitative data.

> *Note*: This is the additional course we wish to require in the change from an Ed.D. to a Ph.D. program title.

• *Research in Curriculum and Instruction (EDG 7944)* is taken during the semester in which students will take the Qualifying Examinations, or the semester before. In this course, they write the literature review for their dissertation study.

• *Advanced Educational Research (EDG 7482)* prepares students to write their dissertation proposal. Before taking this course, students meet with their Dissertation Committee Chair to get approval for their research topic. EDG 7482 is taken in your last or next-to-last semester of course work.

We note that if students admitted to the doctoral program have not taken STA 6113 and EDF 6481, or their equivalents, those courses will be required and will take the place of two area of specialization electives. So, students without sufficient prior research course work will take 18-21 total research credits, rather than 15.

Specialized Course Work

Specialized course work (24 credits in this proposal) focuses on the student's Area of Specialization in preparation for conducting the dissertation study. Students initially consult with their Program Advisor, and later their Dissertation Committee Chair, when selecting courses related to their Area of Specialization. These courses build upon what students learned in the core C&I courses and help them to shape their research questions, conceptual framework, and methodology.

The specialized course work represents our belief in balancing flexibility and focus. We want students to have the flexibility to create a Plan of Study that is creative and fits with their research interests. For example, one current student has taken courses in global education and early childhood education in order to conduct a study of a pre-school that bases its curriculum on ideas from Reggio Emilia (an influential Italian approach to early childhood education). Another current student has course work in instructional technology and professional development because of her interests in how and why teachers use instructional technology in their practice.

At the same time, students must have a clearly stated and well-justified focus. All of our tenured faculty members advise doctoral students, and we know that students must hone in on a topic of interest fairly early in their doctoral studies, in order to examine the empirical research and theoretical ideas related to that topic. When asking faculty members to serve on their Dissertation Committee, students must first give the professor a Concept Paper that describes the student's background learning, current research questions, rationale for a study, and ideas about methodology for the study.

Dissertation

Each student's dissertation topic is developed *throughout* course work. While doing research and class projects, students learn how class work and assignments can shape their dissertation topic. We encourage students to take courses with a variety of faculty members in order to learn a range of educational perspectives and identify potential committee members. Our website includes a statement that we "encourage our doctoral students to investigate courses and educational experiences throughout the College and the University as part of their graduate programs." After the approval of the Dissertation Proposal and the IRB application, students will take a minimum of 15 dissertation credits.

Comparisons with Other Ph.D. Programs

In *Appendix D*, we compare our program requirements with 5 state universities in Florida and 5 prestigious national universities. The national universities in the comparison were chosen in light of their strong reputations, but without prior knowledge of their requirements.

We do not have data for 2 of the 10 universities in terms of the total course credits required just for the doctoral program. Based on the remaining 8 universities, the average number of course credits required is 68.4. Out of the 8 universities, 3 require fewer than 65 credit hours (57–62) for the doctoral program, whereas 4 universities require more than 65 credit hours (66–72), and 1 requires 93 credits for the doctoral program. We require 66 credit hours for the CCEI doctoral program.

The average number of core credits required is 11.6. Out of the 10 universities, 5 of them require fewer than 12 core credits and 5 require more than 12 core credits. Our doctoral program requires 12 core credits.

The average number of research credits required is 14.2. Out of the 10 universities, 7 of them require 12-13 research credits (not including courses required to take doctoral-level work), whereas 2 universities require more than 15 research credits. Our program at FAU will require 15 doctoral-level research credits and 6 additional research credits for students who have not taken introductory graduate-level research courses.

Our approach to area of specialization course work is right in line with many other universities. Often, major universities in the USA require specialized but unspecified course work as part of their program. The 5 prestigious out-of-state universities in *Appendix D* have an average of 26.4 unspecified credits for students to take courses in their area of specialization. Our Ph.D. program proposal has 24 such credits.

Finally, 9 of the 10 doctoral programs included require dissertation credits. The mean number of credits for the 9 programs is 18.7, and 4 of the 10 require 12 credits. Our program at FAU requires 15 dissertation credits.

In all of the categories analyzed above – total credits, core credits, research course credits, unspecified area of specialization credits, and dissertation credits – the doctoral program in Curriculum and Instruction is comparable to the state and national universities we examined. The proposed addition of an advanced research course will strengthen these requirements. While one cannot judge the quality of coursework from the number of credits required, we believe the program to be quite rigorous, as do our students (see a subsequent section for their comments).

Attributes of the Doctoral Program

The Doctor of Education degree program has been strengthened over the years in a number of ways. After noting the purposes of this program, we will summarize the program's attributes in terms of faculty, curriculum, student admission and advising, communication with students, and student and program assessment.

Program Purposes

One of our primary purposes in the doctoral program is to prepare graduates to conduct original empirical research studies so that they may advance knowledge in their field of inquiry. We also prepare graduates to make effective presentations at state, national, and international conferences. The chart in *Appendix E* indicates selected doctoral program graduates' professional positions, publication, and conference presentations.

Our students graduate from this program and assume varied professional positions. The CCEI/Ed.D. website describes this:

> *Ed.D. candidates are classroom teachers and district curriculum coordinators, they are professors, and they are community organization education directors. Some of our candidates pursue specific content fields such as mathematics, science, English/language arts, social studies, or arts education. Others design areas of concentration that focus on fields such as professional development in content areas or technology. The Ed.D. program of study is structured, yet flexible enough to allow individuals to pursue their own inquiry and extend their professional expertise in ways most appropriate to their career goals.* (http://www.coe.fau.edu/ccei/EDDDefault.htm)

We expect students in the doctoral program to become "Collaborators, Consumers, Critics, and Contributors" with regard to research, practice, and policy. The following language is taken from our department website, and it summarizes our program philosophy.

Research

Our doctoral program provides course work and field experiences that encourage and support students as collaborators in their inquiry and professional study. Doctoral students in our program are expected to read and interpret research with colleagues in their professional fields. As educational research consumers, they develop increasing ability to relate theory to practice and articulate the limitations and possibilities that research offers to practitioners. Students have multiple opportunities to serve as critics of theory and research in courses that consider quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods designs used in education. Doctoral students also become contributors to their fields as they engage in original research, design and implement studies with faculty members and peers and ultimately complete the dissertation process. Candidates are encouraged throughout the program to apply their research, present for professional and public audiences, and submit written material for publication as scholars.

Practice

The Ed. D. in Curriculum and Instruction values practice and practitioners. Doctoral students share their professional work experiences as collaborators, by articulating the approaches, strategies, and research-based methods that constitute their success in

classroom, building, district, and community contexts. Students investigate, as consumers, the practices that historically and currently frame content area teaching and learning. Many of them learn how to evaluate school and classroom programs, in addition to their investigations of how research results may apply to practice. They are encouraged to serve as critics of practices by examining micro and macro research studies and by examining their own lived experience. Through areas of concentration in their programs of study, doctoral students can also engage in internships, independent studies, and fieldwork to further inform their expertise. All educators are practitioners and in this doctoral program, students are supported as they reflect on their work and serve as contributors to the larger conversation about effective and responsive practices that address the needs of all learners.

<u>Policy</u>

It is not enough to engage successfully in personally fulfilling professional goals in this age of accountability and scrutiny of the educational process. Our doctoral students learn about how policy decisions are made and who makes them. Students act as collaborators in decision making for the purpose of improving the schooling experience for families, school personnel, and communities. Doctoral students become active inquirers into the political process at the local and state levels and investigate the roles that the federal government plays in educational policies and procedures. As such, they become informed consumers in the political process with respect to education as well as capable critics who are able to articulate how and why policies succeed or fail. The Ed. D. Program in Curriculum and Instruction provides multiple opportunities for doctoral students to study decision-making on the global level by analyzing educational policy issues in other countries. Students explore policy, research, and practice with perspectives on equity and access that are cornerstones of education. Internships and study abroad experiences further inform students' expertise in the policies and practices of education around the world. Doctoral students become contributors by their presence, their research, and their active integration of policy awareness in their own professional surroundings.

Faculty Profile

CCEI currently has <u>9 faculty members</u> in tenure-track teaching positions, of whom 8 are tenured Associate and Full Professors. CCEI faculty are productive scholars, even while carrying a 3-course-per-semester teaching assignment. Here is a 2-year look at the number of faculty publications and presentations, and their committee service work.

Publications and National/International Presentations

	2008-2009	2009-2010
Published book chapters and articles	12	18
International and national presentations	15	25

Committee Service Work (total CCEI faculty)

	2009-2010	2010-2011
Department committee service	15	22
College committee service	16	21
University committee service	13	16

New Hire for January 2011

In March, 2010, we hired a distinguished Professor, Dr. Lourdes Soto, who will join us in January 2011. Dr. Soto is a renowned scholar in curriculum theory, research about Latino students and families, and early childhood curriculum. Two of her prior university positions were at Penn State University and the University of Texas-Austin. Dr. Soto will teach core courses in the Doctoral Program and the M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction, as well as several graduate courses in the Early Childhood Education program. Her expertise and experience in mentoring doctoral students and young scholars will strengthen our department, and will greatly benefit our doctoral students.

Curriculum

As noted earlier, we have well-developed department doctoral core courses. In 2008 we created "course teams" for the 4 core courses and 1 research course in the doctoral program that are taught by CCEI faculty, so that faculty members could discuss and analyze course content and instructional strategies. The faculty members on each team also teach the course.

In 2009, 2 core doctoral courses (EDF 7758 and EDF 7917) were revised and renamed. These changes were made in accordance with the formal FAU program approval process. Over the past few years we included more current curriculum theory in EDG 7250 and added a text to that course. Every year, we discuss the courses and how we might tighten the alignment between them.

We also hold to rigorous research requirements for students, and emphasize their writing and analytical skills. Students take a Qualifying Examination at the end of course work, and our *Doctoral Student Handbook* and the newsletter *DocData* communicate clearly the policies and procedures related to the exam. There is a pool of 10 questions that comprise the Curriculum and Instruction portion of the exam. Each student studies all 10 questions and then answers 2-3 of them on the examination. Students answer 1 methodology question, which is either taken from 2 qualitative methodology questions or from a quantitative methodology question. There are also 1-2 Area of Specialization questions, which are written especially for each student and require the student to synthesize research connected to their chosen dissertation topic.

Student Admission and Advising

Before 2004, the number of students applying to the doctoral program was quite small. From 2004-2010, we saw a great upsurge in interest, and recently we were admitting 25-30 students per year. However, in order to raise the quality of students admitted to the program, and allow us to serve our students better as advisors, we set a limit of 10 students admitted to the program each semester. This policy began in Spring 2010, and we will admit only in the Fall and Spring terms. In Spring 2010 we admitted 10 students, and in Fall 2010 we admitted 8.

We have changed our admission criteria for the doctoral program, so that there is a weighting of undergraduate and graduate grades; GRE scores on the quantitative, verbal, and writing sections; an interview with faculty; and an on-site writing sample completed after the interview. This puts more emphasis on writing skills and the interview, and removes the GRE minimum scores as a "gatekeeper" for admission.

Department faculty members take great pride in mentoring doctoral students, in order to enhance students' writing, critical thinking, and researching skills. In the last 3 years there has been a substantial expansion in the number of doctoral Program Advisors and Dissertation Committee Chairs in CCEI:

	Number of Faculty Program Advisors	Number of Dissertation Chairs
Fall 2007	3	2
Fall 2010	9	5

Once or twice a year, we hold a Doctoral Advising Workshop for department faculty. In 2009-2010, we conducted two Dissertation Writing Workshops for students, which will be held again during this academic year. We have reached out to faculty in the Department of Teaching and Learning by speaking at a department meeting and encouraging them to serve on Curriculum and Instruction dissertation committees and co-chair dissertations, if asked by a student.

Communication with Students

Since 2007, we have held one or two Graduate Colloquia each year, in which graduate students present examples of their work and we discuss issues related to their graduate studies. This year, we changed the format to a series of Research Brown Bags, in which one professor and one doctoral student present about their research. Brown Bags were held in September and October of 2010, and there will be 4 more monthly sessions during the academic year. At the end of the academic year, we will hold a Doctoral Student Reception.

Each Fall and Spring semester since 2005 (with the exception of 1 year), we have sent students an electronic newsletter named *DocData,* in order to inform them about courses in the program, recent and upcoming events, and news of doctoral students. Two CCEI doctoral-level Graduate Assistants write the newsletter, with editing by the Department Chair. In addition, the *Doctoral Student Handbook* is sent to every doctoral student and to faculty members. This document has undergone two revisions since it was first created in 2005, and the latest edition will be sent in early November of 2010. Work on the *Handbook* was also done by departmental GA's, in coordination with the Chair.

Student and Program Assessment

For the doctoral program, we have determined 3 "Critical Assignments" that will document student performance related to the three Standards of *Content, Communication, and Critical Thinking*. Each of these assignments has an accompanying rubric that assesses student work as "Exceeds Expectations," "Meets Expectations," or "Does Not Meet Expectations."

• EDG 7938, *Doctoral Seminar*, will be the "Keystone" course because it is taken at the start of a student's program. We will assess student work on an Annotated Bibliography of empirical studies.

• The Qualifying Examination will be the "Cornerstone" course, because it occurs at or near the conclusion of a student's course work. We assess student work with regard to their answers on the examination.

• The Doctoral Dissertation Defense will be the "Capstone" experience because it is the last work done by the student. We will evaluate both their oral and written presentations of the dissertation.

We will use the data generated from the Critical Assignments to discuss student performance and to make program decisions related to the issues raised. Also, we will have two other forms of evidence to make programmatic decisions:

• Exit Interviews with graduating students

• Annual Survey of current doctoral students in the program

G.

Market and Trends: Ed.D. and Ph.D. Programs in Colleges of Education

Through this name change, we wish to distinguish the program offered at Florida Atlantic University from doctoral programs in regional institutions that offer an Ed.D. degree with no requirements of a dissertation, or that accept practice-oriented projects that are not equivalent to the rigor of an original empirical dissertation. Our local area is being directly affected by the trend to bifurcate Ed.D. and Ph.D. programs. Several institutions in our service area, including Nova Southeastern University and Lynn University, have instituted Ed.D. programs that reflect programmatic iterations of these new visions for the Ed.D. Lynn University's Ed.D. program, for example, is described as follows on the university website:

> *A 3-year degree geared toward working professionals who want to be leaders in metropolitan education systems. It equips practitioner-scholars with the skills needed to connect research with practice, lead high-performing organizations, and contribute to students learning. You will find intellectual and professional growth in the new Ed.D., which has been developed in conjunction with the Carnegie Foundation on the Education Doctorate.*
> ** Capstone experience instead of a dissertation- finish your degree in 3 years (*http://www.lynn.edu/academics/areas-of-study/educational-doctorate-of-practice)

In contrast, CCEI's Ed.D. has been and continues to be a degree program in which all students must perform well in 4 rigorous core courses that emphasize the theories and research that are related to curriculum and instruction, perform well in at least 5 courses at the masters or doctoral level in research, pass a 2-day Qualifying Examination, and successfully complete original research resulting in a dissertation. It is already a demanding degree program, and we believe that the additional requirement of the Advanced Qualitative Research course (EDA 7416) will strengthen it further.

Many of our graduates assume positions that underscore the desirability of a Ph.D. with rigorous research training and a dissertation (see *Appendix E*). In contrast with the trends of competing Ed.D. programs, our Ed.D. program addresses students' research preparation explicitly, with the goal that our graduates will be not only consumers of research but also researchers themselves.

We are concerned that if we do not make this name change in a timely manner, we will lose students in two specific ways: (1) students will go to universities with less rigorous 3-year programs with no dissertations and/or limited research requirements, given that the Ed.D. titled degree would be the same in the field; (2) students will go to universities with Ph.D. programs. Either way, FAU and the College of Education would be at a distinct disadvantage.

17

H.

Staffing and Cost Considerations

This proposal will have minimal costs, which are related to staffing considerations.

(1) Students will take an existing course (EDA 7416) and no new courses will be developed. We have spoken with a faculty member who teaches this course, and have discussed the possibility that a second section of the course may be necessary during the transition period, to accommodate current students who wish to change their Ed.D. to a Ph.D. Many of our students already take the course during their degree program because they are encouraged by their Program Advisor to do so; because of that, there should not be a large number of new students enrolling.

(2) The mentoring load on the faculty will be unchanged, and no new faculty will be needed to advise or teach in the program. In CCEI, there are 8 full-time faculty members who have Graduate Faculty Status A, and 1 faculty member is preparing an application for Graduate Faculty Status A during 2010-2011. The Full Professor who will join our faculty in January 2011 is expected to apply for that status soon after she arrives.

(3) The proposal for this name change does not necessitate additional Faculty or Graduate Assistant positions. We request no additional funding for Graduate Assistants or for student scholarships.

(4) Any effect on enrollment in research course work in other university units will be minimal. We will not admit more than 10 students in each of two semesters, which is fewer students than in the past 4 years. Our hope is that students can take EDA 7416 as their advanced qualitative research course. If they cannot do this, for whatever reason, a few students may take a research course outside the COE. Two possible courses for them to take at FAU, if approved by the other departments, would be: *Seminar in Advanced Qualitative Methods*, SYA 6315 (Sociology, last offered in Spring 2011) or *Qualitative Communication Research,* COM 6340, (Communication and Multimedia Studies, last offered in Spring 2011). Our students might also take a research course from another university, if needed.

I.

Current Students: Demand and Future Credibility

As professors who teach regularly in the program and chair dissertations, we are constantly asked by students why our program is an Ed.D. and not a Ph.D. More and more students are aware of the differences that have become clear in their fields; more and more students report that FAU's Ed.D. program in Curriculum and Instruction reflects the rigor and requirements of recognized Ph.D. programs, including not only a dissertation process but also a series of research courses and a qualifying examination process.

On July 20, 2010, we sent our current doctoral students a brief survey in order to discern their opinions about this proposed name change to the doctoral degree program. We gave the students only 5 days to return their surveys to the department office. In that time, 42 students responded, an impressive number in the middle of the summer. Data from this survey are summarized below.

Question #1: *Please provide a simple "YES" OR "NO" regarding whether you would be in favor of a change in the degree from Ed.D. to Ph.D., regardless of where you are in the current program.* In response to this yes/no question, 41 students checked yes/in favor of the name change and 1 student checked no. The student who disagreed later reported in an e-mail message that she had not fully understood the situation, and would now support the change of degree title.

Questions # 2, 3, and 4 asked students to respond to a possible change with respect to a) their own professional goals, b) their views on the rigor of our current Ed.D. program and finally, and c) how they see the differences between the Ph.D. and the newer Ed.D. programs that they have encountered here in South Florida and elsewhere. The responses are summarized below. Comments are offered verbatim in the Tables below.

In Table 1, students noted their intentions to teach at the college level, conduct research and evaluation, and publish in their fields. They also acknowledged the advantages of the FAU CCEI Ed.D. degree (cost and convenience) as well as the research experience they are gaining in the program. Several also noted the increased time necessary for conducting original research resulting in a dissertation, and they seem willing to do so.

Table 1
Doctoral student comments on professional/job opportunities pertaining to proposed degree name change

This is actually the degree I was looking for, a PHD in math education. I only settled for the Ed.D because FAU did not offer a PHD; and FAU's location is convenient for me. (To)

I believe that a PhD would indicate a strong researcher background to my employers and to research publications, which will be valuable to me in the future. (Ol)

My long-term personal goals include pursuing a career in higher education and continuing research in my field, which I am very passionate about; therefore, I plan to take as much time as is necessary to collect/analyze data and write my dissertation. While I am currently an elementary school teacher, my

vision extends beyond my individual classroom, and conducting research and writing are a crucial part of meeting my goals. (Ur)

I believe my job opportunities would be greater. (Pa)

This change would be extremely valuable for me. The research aspect of the degree is and has been extremely important to me in terms of knowing how to read, understand, and implement research done by others as well as become competent and confident to perform and share my own research (Mu)

The Ph.D. would help support and validate my educational background and preparation for future work as a researcher and evaluator. (Va)

To fulfill my professional goals, a Ph.D. degree is more attractive since it clearly communicates that I would have a strong background in research, which is particularly important because I work in higher education. (De)

I know that the college I work for, IRSC, prefers its faculty to have Ph.D. degrees. Also, as an Assistant Professor at IRSC a Ph.D. would give me more potential for publishing and speaking. (Fr)

I will in fact have all of the additionally proposed courses for the proposed Ph.D. so it would only be the difference in a set of letters, but that could mean all the difference in my future career options and pay scale. (Bi)

Although as educators we should never stray too far from teacher practice, I would like for the degree earned to represent the level of the work I hope to accomplish in the future including college-level teaching, research, and publishing. (Br)

*Enable me to compete for jobs with others who have PhD degree. (*Mu)

I plan to pursue full time teaching at a university. A Ph.D. would open more doors for me at universities that are researched based. (S)

I've been a professor at a community college for the past 2 decades and plan to retire soon and perhaps relocate to another college or university. I've found that most departments and administrators prefer the PhD to an Ed.D, and if I choose to move to another institution, the PhD is always well-respected. In fact, the dean of academic affairs at the college where I teach stated that "some Ed.D. programs prepare you very well for administrative work. For instructors, however, I still believe that the Ph.D. is much more worthwhile and more highly respected. I also would probably give initial preference to a Ph.D. candidate versus an Ed.D. applicant." (St)

Table 2 attests to the quality of the program that CCEI currently offers. However, students also repeatedly mention the competing Ed.D. degree programs and the public perception that accompanies them.

Table 2
Doctoral student comments on the rigor of the current CCEI Ed.D. program
Even though the Ed.D. program here at FAU is as rigorous as a Ph.D. program, there's still the perception that the former is easier to earn. In fact, a college administrator, being interviewed for my doctoral dissertation research, just stated that he thought the primary difference between the two degrees is that the "Ed.D. doesn't draw from original data." My qualitative study is based on original data that I've generated from hours of interviews with students and college employees. Colleagues, as well, have commented to me, on the distinction between the two—and the general perception is that an Ed..D program is not as rigorous: some have even asked whether students—to earn an Ed.D.—must write a dissertation!! (St)*
I feel that the work we have completed in the doctoral program in CCEI is at least as rigorous as the PhD program in Ed Leadership. Further, the PhD is a more recognized degree and would better represent the level of coursework and research that has been completed. (Br)
Within my studies I would be completing the requirements similar to that of a Ph.D., but under the title of Ed.D. I feel that if you have put forth the effort, research, and dedication as required by the discipline, you should receive the same prestige. (Bro)
I am proud and happy to be in this program. I have learned a great deal and it is a rigorous program. Other people do not think an Ed.D. degree is as valuable or as intense as a PhD. (Es)
Because of the hard work of the COE graduate faculty, FAU's current doctoral program is already aligned with research-based institutions. With current rigorous class and research based dissertation requirements, awarding the PhD, rather than the Ed.D. makes more sense, practically and personally. Students are already fulfilling most PhD requirements, and are not rewarded for their work with the same degree. (Ne)
The more practitioner-oriented Ed.D. program belies the process that students actually undergo to complete this degree at FAU. (Bo)
The coursework and rigor of the COE Ed.D. program are superior. The requirements are supportive of the eventual dissertation beginning with the Doctoral Seminar. Students are informed of the seriousness of the eventual codification of their expertise in the preparation of their execution of the myriad tasks and requirements to fulfill the dissertation project with a successful product upon completion. In short, the research requirements and rigor of FAU's COE Ed.D. is difficult, somewhat daunting, certainly respectably professional.   (Sa)
Personally, I felt that I wanted to pursue a Ph.D. but really liked the CCEI program. I didn't want to pursue Ed. Leadership. I settled on CCEI because it is what I wanted to do, but I would be thrilled if I had the option of applying for and fulfilling any additional requirements to earn a Ph.D. (Sh)

Table 3 demonstrates the students' varying amount of knowledge about advanced degrees in Colleges of Education. However, especially among those who are far along in the Ed.D. program, there is a clear awareness of the competition among doctoral programs in their schools, colleges, and communities. It is important to note that some of the students do see this as a new phenomenon in the field of education. They applied for an Ed.D. program at FAU because of the program's reputation and quality.

Table 3
Doctoral student comments regarding the differences between Ph.D. and newly designed Ed.Ds

The Ed.D. and the Ph.D. are similar where the programs for each have a research and dissertation requirement. However, as practice-oriented Ed.D. programs increase in number, many will believe that only the Ph.D. designation retains the traditional requirement of a dissertation. That mistaken assumption will be detrimental for any professionals who hold the Ed.D. (Ma)

The many Ed.D. programs that are now becoming available that do not require research courses and a dissertation have devalued the past belief that Ed.D. programs are an accepted, authentic, and valued doctoral program in the field of education. Eventually, the Ed.D. will become a credential that is valued less than a Ph.D. because of the lack of a research focus and the lack of dissertation work that other doctoral programs require. (Va)

Given that there is currently a move in academic programs at other universities to permit the Ed.D. to be earned without a dissertation or research requirement, it is important to me that a distinction is made between a degree that can be earned with and without a dissertation. The effort that I have made to earn my degree should be recognized. (Ma)
My specialization is science where there are only Ph.D.s. Sometimes I feel like people think it's "less" of a valuable doctorate than a Ph.D. (Wa)

As an elementary educator, people both in and out, of the field have more familiarity with the research –based expectations of earning a Ph.D, thus it receives more respect in both communities. The practice based Ed.D is less familiar to the general population and is acknowledged with less prestige. With all the struggles facing today's teachers, those earning advanced degrees need to have as many tools available to them that will help promote the advancement of solid, research-based education practices- the Ph.D. is a tool to accomplish that goal. (Pa)

I see some of these new Ed.D. programs that do not require as much work and research as I have completed through my coursework. If the Ed.D. is going in the direction of a "shortcut" terminal degree, I would prefer to receive a Ph.D. (Mc)

While I personally do not fully understand the difference between an Ed.D. and a PhD, most people with whom I speak have never heard of an Ed.D. I usually just tell them that I'm working on a PhD just so they know that it's a real degree. (So)

With the onset of online Ed.D degrees and colleges offering the Ed.D for much less rigor and legwork on the part of the student, the Ed.D being sought at our university loses some of its prestige. (Sc)

Today many Ed.D programs do not have a dissertation component to them. They just have practitioner assignments. The value of the Ed.D designation has been compromised and watered down because of this. Changing our program to a Ph.D will, therefore, set our program apart from these pseudo Ed.D degrees, and give it more credibility. (Th)

We take an Ed.D degree just like Nova students who have a comparatively lighter research demand. Even though our program is more rigorous than Nova's, we share the same degree title. FAU stands to welcome its first class of M.D. students in 2011. With the medical school will come a new interest in FAU. Add to that the addition the Engineering program's new "living learning laboratory" the first to be built to LEED platinum standards in the State of Florida. Both changes signal the ushering in of a new era for FAU and increased spotlight on the research and work of students and faculty. Why shouldn't FAU College of Education students be a part of this new era? (Ta)

J.

Conclusion

The doctoral program in Curriculum and Instruction already conveys the rigor of comparable Ph.D. programs that are research-centered. We have the necessary faculty expertise and commitment to support a high quality Ph.D. program. Our graduate faculty are researchers, experienced practitioners, and committed leaders. Because of the changing nature of Ed.D. programs, it is vital that our current program's degree title reflect the requirements and outcomes that students actually experience.

References

Guthrie, J. W. (2009). The case for a modern doctor of education degree (Ed.D.): Multipurpose education doctorates no longer appropriate. *Peabody Journal of Education, 84*, 3-8.

Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders*. New York: Education Schools Project.

Shulman, L. S., Golde, C. M., Conklin Bueschel, A., & Garabedian, K. J. (2006). Reclaiming education's doctorates: A critique and a proposal. *Educational Researcher, 35*(3), 25-32.

Appendix A

History of the Doctoral Program in Curriculum and Instruction

Year	Program Notes
1970 – 71	*Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction* approved, with a special concentration on junior college teaching
1974 – 75	Ed.D. in C & I specifications: • 135 quarter credits = 90 semester credits beyond the Bachelors degree • Supervised internship = 9 credits • 3 Research courses (5 credits each): Statistics in social sciences, advanced statistics in education, and educational research • Dissertation = 20 credits • Exit examination (from now on, a part of the program)
1975 – 81	Same as above
1981 - 1982	Ed.D. in C & I specifications: • 104 semester credits beyond Bachelors degree • Teaching field = 30 credits • Cognate (specialization) = 18 credits • Professional education = 20 credits • 3 Research courses (10 semester credits): Statistics in social sciences (4), advanced statistics in education (3), and educational research (3) • Dissertation = 20 credits • Supervised internship = 6 credits
1982 - 85	Same as above
1985 – 86	Name change: *Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction – Elementary Education* • 112 semester credits beyond Bachelors degree • Core courses = 12 credits • Teaching field = 30 credits • Cognate (specialization) = 18 credits • Professional education = 20 credits • Research and statistics = 12 credits • Dissertation = 20 credits • Supervised internship no longer in the program
1986 – 1997	Same as above

1997 – 99	Credits same as 1986 Ed.D. program Name Change: *Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction* • C & I courses introduced (EDG prefix) • Note: Still, none of today's core courses in the Ed.D. program were in the program of study
1999 – 2001	Same as above
2001 – 2002	Change from 112 credits to 102 credits 6 New C & I doctoral courses approved: *EDG 6303, EDG 6414, EDG 7938, EDG 7250, EDG 7251, EDG 7944* The doctorate requires 102 credits with a minimum requirement of 66 credits beyond the Master's degree: • Core courses = 15 credits • Cognate (Specialization area) = 15 credits • Elective courses = 12 credits • Research courses = 9 credits • Dissertation = 15 credits
2002 – 2005	Same as above
2005 - 2008	Program courses reorganized in 2005-2006 (no new courses): • Core courses = 12 credits • Exploratory elective courses = 12 credits • Initial research courses = 6 credits (STA 7113, EDA 6415) • Area of Specialization elective courses = 15 credits • Advanced Research courses = 6 credits (EDF 7482, EDG 7944) • Dissertation = 15 credits • Note: STA 6113 & EDF 6481 are prerequisite research courses, so students must take 6 research courses beyond the Bachelors degree New Department Formed in Summer 2007: *Curriculum, Culture, and Educational Inquiry*
2008 - 2009	New course designations and titles for 2 doctoral courses in Spring 2009: • EDG 6414 becomes EDF 7758, Trends in Analyzing Instructional Practices • EDG 6303 becomes EDF 7917, Instructional Policies and the Teaching Profession
2009 - 2010	Same as above

L.

Appendix B

Doctoral Program Descriptions

Doctor of Education Degree (Ed.D.) in Curriculum and Instruction

Department of Curriculum, Culture, and Educational Inquiry

Program Description

The **Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) in Curriculum and Instruction** degree provides a theoretical and practical course of study in curriculum and instruction. The program is designed for teachers, curriculum coordinators, corporate and agency curriculum planners, academics, and other professional educators. The program enables students to develop a theoretical and conceptual framework for studying teaching and learning, and also encourages professional educators to develop knowledge and practice in their own fields of specialization. The Ed.D. culminates in a dissertation, focused on a particular question and area of investigation that interests the doctoral candidate and benefits the profession. Doctoral candidates have opportunities to participate with faculty on research, in teaching, and in professional activities, including publishing and conference presentations. A student should take no more than 12 credits in this program as a non-degree student before being officially admitted.

Core Courses: 12 credits
> Take <u>all</u> of the following courses (all 3 credits):
> EDG 7938   Doctoral Seminar *(Take this course in the 1st or 2nd semester of your program)*
> EDF 7758   Trends in Analyzing Instructional Practices
> EDG 7250   Constructing Models of School Curriculum
> EDF 7917   Instructional Policies and the Teaching Profession *(Take this course after EDF 7758)*
> Core Courses may not be substituted for or taken as independent studies except under extreme circumstances.

Exploratory Electives: 12 graduate credits at the 6000 level or above
> These courses should be chosen after speaking with the Program Advisor. They should be taken early in the program.

Initial Research Courses: 6 credits
> Take these courses early in the program.
> STA 7114   Advanced Educational Statistics *(Department of Educational Leadership)*
> EDA 6415   Introduction to Qualitative Analysis *(Department of Educational Leadership)*

Area of Specialization Electives: 15 credits at the 6000 level or above
> These courses relate to the student's dissertation interests and should be chosen after speaking with the Program Advisor. Generally, they are taken after the dissertation research question has been identified.

Advanced Research Courses: 6 credits
These courses should be taken in the last semester or two of coursework.
EDG 7944   Research in Curriculum and Instruction
(Take this course just before the semester of the Qualifying Examination)
EDF 7482   Advanced Educational Research (*Department of Educational Leadership*)
(Take this course before or during the semester of the Qualifying Examination)

Qualifying Examination
The date of the Qualifying Examination is to be arranged with your Program Advisor upon completion of coursework.

Dissertation: 15 credits
EDG 7980   Dissertation

A student may also have to take some of the following courses, depending on previous coursework:

EDG 6224   U.S. Curricular Trends and Issues
EDG 6253   Design Components of Curriculum
EDG 6285   Program Evaluation in Curriculum and Instruction
STA 6113   Educational Statistics (*Department of Educational Leadership and Research Methodology*)
EDF 6481   Educational Research (*Department of Educational Leadership and Research Methodology*)

ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

For more information on our programs please contact the Department of Curriculum, Culture, and Educational Inquiry. The office is room 353 in the Education building on the Boca campus, phone (561) 297 6594. The department website is: http://www.coe.fau.edu/ccei/

Admission to the **Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction** requires submission of the graduate application form. You will find information about the application process at http://www.fau.edu/graduate/. You may complete the actual graduate application at http://www.fau.edu/graduate/apply.php. For questions regarding your application status or general inquiries, please call the Graduate College Office at (561) 297-3624, the office of Student Services at the College of Education (561) 297-3570, or send an e-mail to graduatecollege@fau.edu.

To be admitted, a student must meet the following requirements:

1) Send in official transcripts of all undergraduate and graduate coursework.

2) Show evidence of a bachelor's and a master's degree from a regionally accredited college/university.

3) Have a grade point average (GPA) of 3.00 or better in the last 60 semester hours of undergraduate work, and a GPA of 3.25 or better in a completed master's degree program.

4) Submit scores on the Verbal Reasoning, Quantitative Reasoning, and Writing sections of the GRE. Graduate Record Examination scores must not be more than 5 years old.

5) Provide Letters of Recommendation from two supervisors and/or colleagues.

6)   Along with the application packet, turn in a professional statement describing career goals and reasons for wanting to enter the program. *(Note: Additional international student requirements may apply.)*

7)   Participate in an interview with faculty members after the department has received the completed admission packet, and write an essay in response to a question about educational issues.

All College of Education Programs are approved by the Florida Department of Education and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Please consult the Florida Atlantic University catalogue from the semester that you were admitted to the program, for more details regarding your program.

M.

Appendix C

**Syllabi for doctoral courses taught within the
Department of Curriculum, Culture, and Educational Inquiry**

Note: The course descriptions in the syllabi are not identical to the course descriptions in the FAU catalogue. Therefore, we have included the following summary of FAU Course Catalogue Descriptions, followed by the descriptions in our course syllabi.

Constructing Models of School Curriculum (EDG 7250) 3 credits
Presents a comprehensive overview of curriculum in terms of its definitions, historical perspective, philosophical bases for curriculum decision-making, including evaluation and implementation and curriculum design principles to construct curriculum models for the 21st Century.

   Syllabus: Students learn about efforts to improve curriculum by examining major curricular reforms and theoretical shifts in the last century of American education. The final product is a plan for a curriculum change that would reconstruct curriculum at the classroom and school levels.

Trends in Analyzing Instructional Practices (EDF 7758) 3 credits
Students examine teaching practices as "models" or "structures" that guide teaching. Students analyze their own teaching, conduct analysis of student work, and explore research on pedagogy.

   Syllabus: This course offers ways to think about teaching practices, from a cognitive perspective of "models," from a pragmatic progressive perspective of "structures" that guide teaching and from a technological perspective. Students will investigate different forms of teaching practice, examine their own teaching through video and analysis of student work, explore new possibilities for teaching, and develop a research-based individual teaching portfolio focused on their own teaching.

Instructional Policies and the Teaching Profession (EDF 7917) 3 credits
Students examine the current political, economic, and social challenges and dilemmas for the teaching profession. The course includes analysis of teacher certification trends, teacher education models, and research on teacher learning.

   Syllabus: Participants examine the current political, economic, and social challenges and dilemmas for the teaching profession. The course includes analysis of teacher certification trends, teacher education models, and research on teacher learning.

Doctoral Seminar (EDG 7938) 3 credits
Prerequisite: Admission to doctoral program
This course should be taken immediately after the candidate is admitted to the doctoral program. It is designed to establish a collegial setting and to familiarize candidates with various aspects of higher education and university life. Candidates will be responsible for selecting, designing, and

completing teaching, research, and service projects. These projects must be completed before qualifying exams are taken.

     Syllabus: This course is designed to orient doctoral students to the nature of doctoral work in curriculum and instruction, scholarly productivity, and the technical requirements associated with conducting scholarly research (e.g., familiarization with publication format as outlined by the American Psychological Association, the requirements of the Division of Sponsored Research and the Institutional Review Board).

     The course is also designed to increase student knowledge and understanding of the features associated with high quality doctoral dissertations and dissertation proposals in the field of curriculum and instruction. The course affords students the opportunity to investigate research interests and projects engaged in by faculty in order to plan for future apprenticeships, internships, and research assistantships in areas of interest.

     Throughout the semester, we will read and discuss research studies and essays reflecting current issues in curriculum and instruction at the micro and macro level, in order to frame current and future investigations in teaching and learning.

Research in Curriculum and Instruction (EDG 7944) 3 credits
Prerequisites: EDF 7758, EDF 7917, EDG 7250, EDG 7938
Projects completed in doctoral seminar will be scrutinized to determine their research quality and educational contributions. Emphasis is placed on accurate integration among research, curriculum, and instruction protocols.

     Syllabus: This course provides an overview of research programs in curriculum and instruction, while offering students a structure and context for developing literature reviews for dissertation proposals.

Department of Curriculum, Culture and Educational Inquiry
College of Education
Florida Atlantic University

COURSE TITLE: EDG 7250, Constructing Models of School Curriculum

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Students learn about efforts to improve curriculum by examining major curricular reforms and theoretical shifts in the last century of American education. The final product is a plan for a curriculum change that would reconstruct curriculum at the classroom and school levels.

COURSE CONNECTION TO CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

As reflective decision-makers, class participants will gain vital information about curriculum, consider philosophical and historical issues associated with schooling, and provide evidence of being a capable thinker and writer about educational issues.

REQUIRED TEXTS

Flinders, D., & Thornton, S. (2009). *The curriculum studies reader* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge. (ISBN: 9780415963220)

Dewey, J. (1938; 1997). *Experience and education*. New York: Simon and Schuster. (ISBN 0684838281)

Bruner, J. S. (1960; 2004). *The process of education*. Boston: Harvard University Press. (Paperback; 92 pp.; ISBN 0674710010)

Freire, P. (1970; 2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. (Paperback; 192 pp.; ISBN 0826412769).

Sleeter, C. (2005). *Un-standardizing curriculum: Multicultural teaching in standards-based classrooms.* New York: Teachers College Press. (ISBN: 0807746215)

SUGGESTED RESOURCES

Kliebard, H. M. (1987; 2004) (3rd ed.). *The struggle for the American curriculum, 1893-1958.* New York: Taylor and Francis. (Paperback; 330 pp.; ISBN 0415948916)

Beane, J., & Apple, M. (1995). The case for democratic schools. In M. Apple & J. Beane (Eds.), *Democratic schools* (pp. 1-25). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Darling Hammond, L. (2004). From 'separate but equal' to 'No Child Left Behind': The collision of new standards and old inequalities. In D. Meier & G. Woods (Eds.), *Many children left behind* (pp. 3-32). New York: Beacon Press.

Grumet, M., & Pinar, W. (1996). The curriculum: What are the basics and are we teaching them? In J. Kincheloe & S. Steinberg (Eds.), *Thirteen questions: Re-framing education's conversation* (4th ed.) (pp. 15-30). New York: Peter Lang.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

The course is designed to help students to:
1. Examine their own beliefs, constructs, and theories about curriculum, which will serve as a contextual framework for making curriculum decisions as an educational leader.

2. Demonstrate historical and philosophical knowledge of major curriculum frameworks in order to understand possible future directions in curriculum development and implementation.

3. Write concisely and articulately about the ideas and information in the readings, and take leadership in classroom discussions about the course curriculum.

4. Develop an action plan that describes a curriculum initiative that will promote learning by students and teachers.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Response Essays (Three)
The Response Essay is an opportunity for students to synthesize information from the assigned readings and class discussions. In order to facilitate the writing of a focused essay, the class will collectively identify a few questions/ prompts that will require the integration of multiple readings on a specific topic related to curriculum. Each essay should demonstrate:
-   Clear understanding of the theoretical, philosophical, and/or pragmatic implications of curricular issues central to the topic in focus
-   Thorough/comprehensive response to the curricular question posed
-   Accuracy of knowledge, awareness of complexity/ nuance, appreciation of diverse perspectives pertaining to the topic
-   Writing that is clear, concise, precise and persuasive that follows norms of formal, scholarly writing (e.g. appropriate diction, correct use of APA style, well-crafted introductions, transitions and conclusions)

The essay is intended to be personally meaningful and related to students' professional experiences and beliefs. Recommendation for the scope of this essay is approximately 1500 words (5-6 pages).

Curriculum Action Plan
The Curriculum Action Plan is an opportunity for students to apply the theoretical, philosophical and historical perspectives of curriculum generated in this course to the practice of curriculum design and implementation. The assignment should discuss each of the following (though not necessarily in this order or as distinct sections):
-   Identification of a curricular "problem" (preferably stated as a question) and a brief discussion of its relevance and significance to contemporary curricular concerns
-   An analysis of the problem from a theoretical perspective, drawn from the readings and discussions of this course (The theoretical framework for understanding the problem.)
-   A brief review of relevant literature on the particular problem (This will involve key academic contributions on the specific topic.)
-   The development of an action plan to address the problem (This should emerge from the theory and literature already presented. It should include a clear evaluation plan for assessing the effectiveness of the action plan.)

Those who are currently teachers are strongly encouraged to identify problems of significance to their professional reality.

Participation/ Community building
A graduate seminar assumes equitable contribution by individual students to the collective learning experience of all. However, one cannot always assume that everyone knows how to achieve this. Students will be given credit for their active role in facilitating a learning community in the class,.

Preparation for class discussion will be assumed. This goes beyond doing the assigned readings; it involves engagement with the material and with colleagues in the collective exploration of the relevance and significance of new ideas.

GRADING SCALE

Response Essays (15 each; 3x)	45
Curriculum Action Plan	40
Participation/ Community building	15

Letter	Percent		Grade Points	Letter	Percent		Grade Points
A	92-100	=	4.0	C	73-76	=	2.0
A-	90-91	=	3.67	C-	70-72	=	1.67
B+	87-89	=	3.33	D+	67-69	=	1.33
B	83-86	=	3.00	D	63-67	=	1.00
B-	80-82	=	2.67	D-	60-62	=	0.67
C+	77-79	=	2.33	F	59-00	=	0.00

TEACHING METHODOLOGIES

This class will be run as a seminar, which means that learning takes place **dialogically**. Discussions in class and on Blackboard will be designed to allow students to contribute to others' learning as well as to be good listeners. An openness to diversity of opinions will be expected. The depth of learning will also depend on the extent to which students engage in **self-directed learning**, especially as they engage in **critical reflection** on the readings, assignments and perspectives that emerge in discussions. **One-on-one instruction** is likely as students work with the instructor on individual assignments.

Format for written work
All assignments should be type written, double spaced and stapled. Please retain a copy of all assignments turned in to your instructor. Times font size 12 is recommended. It will be assumed that work will be turned in on time. Your instructor reserves the right to assign late work a "0". All written assignments should be turned in both electronic and print format. Students will be required to submit some assignments through "SafeAssign", a software program that checks documents for originality of work that is accessible through Bb. Plagiarism or similar academic irregularity will result in zero points on the assignment, and likely failure in the course.

Making sure that curriculum "works" for YOU
This is a course that is foundational to your doctoral studies. A doctorate is a program of study that is unique and specialized, catering to the interests of the individual researcher. It is very important that you make sure that the course meets your specific educational and research needs. While it is not intended that this course evolve into an individualized plan of study for each student, it is important to identify ways in which this course informs your development as a researcher and curriculum theorist. Do not hesitate to contact me about any concerns that you might have in fulfilling this goal.

COURSE SCHEDULE

F&T = Flinders & Thornton; Bb= Blackboard; DQ = Discussion questions

Week 1   **Introduction to the course**
         Questions about curriculum

Curriculum in the USA from 1890-1940s

Week 2   **What purpose should curriculum serve?**
         Four perspectives: Humanist, Developmentalists, Advocates of Social Efficiency,
and Social Meliorists
         Reading: Kliebard, Chs. 1 & 2 (Bb)
         DQ: What are the characteristics of each of the four curricular approaches
discussed? Who were their key proponents? What were their central arguments and
rationales? What events characterized the rise and/or fall of their worldviews?

Week 3   **The "science" of curriculum: How should we make decisions on what to teach?**
         Two perspectives: Bobbitt and Montessori
         Reading: F&T 7-33
         DQ: Compare and contrast the perspectives of Bobbitt and Montessori. How do the
points of comparison/ contrast resonate with curriculum decisions made today?

Week 4   **What's the priority? The child, curriculum and/or society?**
         The perspectives of Addams, Dewey and Counts
         Reading: F&T 34-51
         DQ: Addams, Dewey and Counts are still considered as having made significantly
different contributions to the debate on curriculum in their time. In what ways might they
be considered leaders in curriculum and how might they respond to the debates on
curriculum today?
         *Identify topic for Curriculum Action Plan

Week 5   **Curriculum as experience**
         Reading: Dewey Chs. 1-8
         DQ: What is the unique contribution of Dewey to discussions on curriculum? If
Dewey were brought in as a curriculum consultant to your school or county, what advice is
he likely to give?
         First Response Essay due

Curriculum reform in the USA: 1950s & 1960s

Week 6   **Curriculum design and the role of objectives**
         The debate on objectives: Tyler, Popham, Eisner; Doll and Noddings
         Reading: F&T 69-77; 93-105; 107-112; 267- 274; 425-437
         DQ: Identify the multiple perspectives in the debate on objectives. How would
these debates inform lesson planning and related curriculum practices in your school?

Week 7   **Curriculum as content knowledge and forms of disciplines**
          Reading: Bruner, Chs. 1-4; F&T 78-92
         DQ: What was Bruner's contribution to curriculum as a "reformer" in the field?
Evaluate the relevance of his 'reform' in contemporary science (or any content area)
education.

Week 8   **What should be considered 'curriculum'? Definition and content**
Breaking the norm with Jackson, Schwab, Greene; Pinar
Debate between Adler and Noddings
<u>Reading</u>: F&T 114-137; 155-187
<u>DQ</u>: Jackson, Schwab, Greene and Pinar offer different perspectives about how we should think about curriculum as we theorize. What is unique about their ideas?

Curriculum in the USA post-1960s

Week 9   **Is the curriculum emancipatory or oppressive?**
The politics of curriculum: Freire and Apple
<u>Reading:</u>   Freire, Foreword and Chs. 1-3; F&T 199-213.
<u>DQ</u>: Identify the key (and unique) contributions of Freire to our understanding of curriculum. What benefits accrue from considering the political dimensions of curriculum? Who benefits from such an analysis? Who loses?
Second Response Essay due

Week 10   **Multiculturalism vs. standardization in curriculum**
<u>Reading:</u> Sleeter, Chs. 1-4; 9; Optional: any additional chapter(s)!!
<u>DQ</u>: Compare and contrast Sleeter's perspectives on curriculum development with those of Tyler. Additionally, evaluate the contribution – both political and curricular – of Sleeter's text to educators.

Week 11   **Ongoing struggles with standardization**
Critiques of standardization: Au, Eisner, Siskin
<u>Reading:</u> F&T: 286-302; 318-335
<u>DQ</u>: Countries around the world have adopted a national (or standard) curriculum, so what is wrong with standardization in a US context?

Week 12 Curriculum and diversity
Addressing cultural/gender bias in curriculum
<u>Reading</u>: F&T 214-236; 385-398; 362-384; 399-424; 336-347
<u>DQ</u>: What is the role of curriculum in the context of diversity? What should be the process by which we identify and minimize bias?

Week 13   Special topics
Third Response Essay due

Week 14   **Curriculum Action Plan** - presentations

Week 15   *Curriculum Action Plans due*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Apple, M., & Beane, J. (Eds.). (1995). *Democratic schools*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Connelly, F. M., He, M.F., & Phillion, J. (2008). *The Sage handbook of curriculum and instruction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Darling Hammond, L. (2004). From 'separate but equal' to 'No Child Left Behind': The Collision of new standards and old inequalities. In D. Meier & G. Woods, (Ed.), *Many children left behind*. (pp. 3-32). New York: Beacon Press.

Dunn, S. G. (2005). *Philosophical foundations of education: Connecting philosophy to theory and practice.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Greene, M. (2000). *Releasing the imagination: Essays on education, the arts and social change*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Grumet, M. & Pinar, W. (1996). The curriculum: What are the basics and are we teaching them? In J. Kincheloe & S. Steinberg, (Eds.), *Thirteen questions: Re-framing education's conversation*. (4th ed., pp. 15-30). New York: Peter Lang.

Eisner, E. (2005). *Re-imagining schools: The selected works of Elliot W. Eisner*. World Library of Educationalists Series. New York: Routledge.

Jackson, P. (Ed.). (1992). *Handbook of research on curriculum*. McMillan.

Kliebard, H. M. (1987; 2004) (3rd ed.). *The struggle for the American curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Taylor and Francis.

Loewen, J. W. (1995). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your American history textbook got wrong*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Pinar, W., Reynolds, W., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. (1995). *Understanding curriculum*. New York: Peter Lang.

Pinar, w. (2003). *What is curriculum theory?* New York: Routledge.

Reed, R. & Johnson, T. W. (2000). *Philosophical documents in education*. New York: Longman.

Rogovin, P. (2001). *The research workshop: Bringing the world into your classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Watras, J. (2004). *Philosophic conflicts in American education 1893-2000*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon/ Pearson.

AUDIO/VISUAL TECHNOLOGY

- Use your FAU E-Mail Address (check frequently). Go to MyFAU to obtain your e-mail address.
- Blackboard site: Http://Blackboard.fau.edu, bb.fau.edu, or use link under Current students' tab.
- Research using FAU library, Internet browser, professional organizations, government websites
- Computers with word processing, presentation software, and high-speed Internet access are available in all campus computer and library labs. Files may be printed, saved, or e-mailed.

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (A.D.A.), students who require special accommodations due to a disability to properly execute coursework must register with the Office for Students with Disabilities (OSD) located in Boca - SU 133 (561-297-3880), in Davie - MOD I (954-236-1222), or in Jupiter SR 117 (561-799-8585) and follow all OSD procedures. The purpose of this office "is to provide reasonable accommodations to students with disabilities." Students who require assistance should notify the professor immediately by **submitting a letter from the Disabilities Office to your instructor** requesting your need of specific assistance. Without such letter, the instructor is not obligated to make any accommodations for students.

EXPECTATIONS

Attending Florida Atlantic University is a privilege. Professional conduct is expected and includes, but is not limited to, showing respect to colleagues and the instructor; being on time for class; completing assignments prior to entering class; preparing assignments with substantive content and accurate spelling, grammar, and mechanics; and displaying a positive interest in class.

Electronic Devices
Use of any electronic devices in the classroom should be limited to the content and activities taking place at that time. Inappropriate use of such devices may result in removal from the classroom, a reduction in your grade, or some other consequence, as determined by the professor.
Bringing Children or Guests to Class
Because of safety and liability issues, minor children are not permitted in class or in the hallways during class time. Other class visitors must be approved by instructor in advance.

Punctuality, Attendance, and Participation
- Students are expected to be on time and to remain for the duration of each class session. Since late arrivals and early departures are disruptive, they will be treated as absences and may affect your grade.
- Students are expected to attend all of their scheduled university classes and to satisfy all academic objectives as outlined by the instructor. The effect of absences upon grades is determined by the instructor, and the University reserves the right to deal at any time with individual cases of nonattendance. Attendance includes active involvement in all class sessions, class discussions, and class activities, as well as professional conduct in class. Points may be deducted for missing or failing to participate in some or all of a class session. Students are responsible for getting class notes/handouts from peers and making up any missed written assignments. Approval for making up any missed work and setting a new deadline must be granted by the instructor before work is submitted.
- Students are responsible for arranging to make up work missed because of legitimate class absence, such as illness, family emergencies, military obligation, court-imposed legal obligations, or participation in University-sponsored activities (such as athletic or scholastic team, musical and theatrical performances, and debate activities). It is the student's responsibility to give the instructor notice prior to any anticipated absence, and within a reasonable amount of time after an unanticipated absence, ordinarily by the next scheduled class meeting. Instructors must allow each student who is absent for a University-approved

reason the opportunity to make up work missed without any reduction in the student's final course grade as a direct result of such absence.

Religious Accommodation
- In accordance with rules of the Florida Board of Education and Florida law, students have the right to reasonable accommodations from the University in order to observe religious practices and beliefs with regard to admissions, registration, class attendance, and the scheduling of examinations and work assignments.
- Students who wish to be excused from course work, class activities, or examinations must notify the instructor in advance of their intention to participate in religious observation and request an excused absence. The instructor will provide a reasonable opportunity to make up such excused absences.
- Any student who feels aggrieved regarding religious accommodations may present a grievance to the director of Equal Opportunity Programs. Any such grievances will follow Florida Atlantic University's established grievance procedure regarding alleged discrimination.

LiveText
Students in this course are required by the College of Education to have an active LiveText account to track mastery of programs skills, competencies and critical assignments and to meet program and college accreditation requirements. Students must have an account within: the first four (4) weeks of the fall or spring semester, within the first three (3) weeks of summer session, or after the first class of a fast track course. Students who do not have an active LiveText account may have an academic hold placed on their record. Information regarding account activation is provided on the College of Education website, http://coe.fau.edu/livetext.

Dropping the Course
In order to withdraw from a course, it is not sufficient to stop attending class or to inform the instructor of your intention to withdraw. In accordance with university policy, students wishing to withdraw from a course must do so formally through the Registrar's office. It is the students' responsibility to complete all forms. If this is not done, the instructor must assign a grade of F at the end of the semester. **FALL 2010**: "W" drop day is September 3; "F" Drop day is October 15.

Academic Honesty
Students at Florida Atlantic University are expected to maintain the highest ethical standards. Academic dishonesty, including cheating and plagiarism, is considered a serious breach of these ethical standards, because it interferes with the University mission to provide a high quality education in which no student enjoys an unfair advantage over any other. Academic dishonesty is also destructive of the University community, which is grounded in a system of mutual trust and places high value on personal integrity and individual responsibility. Harsh penalties are associated with academic dishonesty, which may include an "F" on the assignment, an "F" in the course, or even removal from the degree program.

➢ Florida Atlantic University Regulation 4.001, "Honor Code, Academic Irregularities, and Student's Academic Grievances" is strictly adhered to in this course (http://www.fau.edu/regulations/chapter4/4.001_Honor_Code.pdf.). The regulation states:

(1) Academic irregularities frustrate the efforts of the faculty and serious students to meet University goals. Since faculty, students and staff have a stake in these goals, the responsibility of all is to discourage academic irregularities by preventative measures and by insuring that appropriate action is taken when irregularities are discovered. Thus, FAU has an honor code requiring a faculty member, student or staff member to notify an Instructor when there is reason to believe an academic irregularity is occurring in a course. The Instructor's duty is to pursue any reasonable allegation, taking action, as described below, where appropriate.
(2) The following shall constitute academic irregularities:

   (a) The use of notes, books or assistance from or to other students while taking an examination or working on other assignments unless specifically authorized by the Instructor are defined as acts of cheating.

   (b) The presentation of words or ideas from any other source as one's own – an act defined as plagiarism.

   (c) Other activities which interfere with the educational mission within the classroom.

➤ In the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (APA), plagiarism is defined as:

> Plagiarism (Principle 6.22). Psychologists do not claim the words and ideas of another as their own; they give credit where credit is due. Quotation marks should be used to indicate the exact words of another. Each time you paraphrase another author (i.e., summarize a passage or rearrange the order of a sentence and change some of the words), you will need to credit the source in the text.

All sources used must be cited, referenced, and listed in the appropriate bibliography/ materials list. Be especially careful about cutting and pasting text from websites. You may not do so without using quotation marks (or indented block quote for 40 words or more) for the text and citing the source. Be sparing in your use of online quotes.

Department of Curriculum, Culture and Educational Inquiry
College of Education
Florida Atlantic University

COURSE TITLE: EDF 7758, Analyzing Instructional Practices

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course offers ways to think about teaching practices, from a cognitive perspective of "models," from a pragmatic progressive perspective of "structures" that guide teaching and from a technological perspective. Students will investigate different forms of teaching practice, examine their own teaching through video and analysis of student work, explore new possibilities for teaching, and develop a research-based individual teaching portfolio focused on their own teaching.

REQUIRED TEXTS

Daniels, H., & Bizar, M. (2005). *Teaching the best practice way: Methods that matter* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Stenhouse.

Eggen, P. D., & Kauchak, D. P. (2006). *Strategies for teachers: Teaching content and thinking skills* (5th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Hiltz, S. R., & Goldman, R. (2005). *Learning together online: Research on asynchronous learning networks.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

McDonald, J. P., Mohr, N., Dichter, A., & McDonald, E. C. (2003). *The power of protocols: An educator's guide to better practice.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Additional handouts for classroom teaching/observation analysis will be distributed by the instructor.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, J. B., Michalove, B., & Shockley, B. (1993). *Engaging children: Community and chaos in the lives of young literacy learners.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Anderson, L. W. (2003). *Classroom assessment: Enhancing the quality of teacher decision making.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational Researcher,* 33(8), 3-15.

Good T. J., & Brophy J. E. (9th ed.) (2003). *Looking in classrooms*. New York: Allyn Bacon.

Johnson, S. M. (1990). *Teachers at work: Achieving success in our schools.* New York: Basic Books.

Joyce, B. & Weil, M. (3rd ed.) (1986). *Models of teaching*. Princeton, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kumashiro. K. K. (2002, Spring). Against repetition: Addressing resistance to anti-oppressive change in the practices of learning, teaching, supervising and researching. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(1).

Lieberman, A., & Miller, J. (Eds.) (2001). *Teachers caught in the action: Professional development that matters.* New York: Teachers College Press.

McLaughlin, M. W., & Oberman, I. (Eds.) (1996). *Teacher learning: new policies, new practices*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Oakes, J., & Lipton, M. (2nd ed.) (2003). *Teaching to change the world*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Pate P. E., Homestead, E. R., & McGinnis K. L. (1997). *Making integrated curriculum work: Teachers, students, and the quest for coherent curriculum.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Raths, J., & McAninch, A.C. (Eds.) (2003). *Teacher beliefs and classroom performance: The impact of teacher education*. Advances in Teacher Education, Vol. 6. Hartford, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Rodgers, C. (2002, Summer). Seeing student learning: Teacher change and the role of reflection. *Harvard Educational Review,* 72 (2).

Saphier, J., & Gower, R. (1987). *The skillful teacher: Building your teaching skills.* Boston, MA: Research for Better Teaching.

Short, K. G., Schroeder, J., Laird, J., Kauffman, G., Ferguson, M. J., & Crawford, K. M. (1996). *Learning together through inquiry: From Columbus to integrated curriculum.* ME: Stenhouse.

Strickland, J. (1997). *From disk to hard copy: Teaching writing with computers.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Wilen, W., Ishler, M., Hutchison, J., & Kindsvatter, R. (4th ed.) (2000). *Dynamics of effective teaching.* New York: Longman.

Wilson, S. M., & Berne, J. (1999). Teacher learning and the acquisition of professional knowledge: An examination of research on contemporary professional development. *Review of Research in Education, 24*, 173-209.

Zemelman, S., Daniels, H., & Hyde, A. (2nd ed.) (1998). *Best practice: New standards for teaching and learning in America's schools.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

1. Identify different models and structures that can guide our thinking about teaching practices. (EAP 4, 5, 6, & 7)
2. Analyze teaching episodes to examine the quality of teaching and learning. (EAP 4, 7, 8, & 10)
3. Examine our own models of instruction and our repertoire of teaching strategies. (EAP 3)
4. Develop analytical skills related to teaching practice. (EAP 1, 4, 7, & 12)
5. Engage in cooperative experiences with classroom colleagues to identify, practice, and assess effective innovative teaching practices. (EAP 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, & 11)

COURSE SCHEDULE

Week 1   **Core Instructional Practices: Conceptualizing and Defining**
Course overview and focus
Introductions
"Essential" teaching strategies (Eggen and Kauchak) vs. " Core"
What we want to learn; what we want to improve

PLEASE READ PRIOR TO THIS CLASS:
Eggen and Kauchak, Chapters 1 - 3

Week 2   **Models for Looking at Teaching**
Constructing a matrix for models and methods

Readings: Eggen and Kauchak, Chapters 4-7

Week 3   **Models for Looking at Teaching**
Matrix, continued

Readings: Eggen and Kauchak, Chapters 8-10

Week 4   **Teacher Change: Shifting Models, Adding to the Repertoire**

Readings: Richardson, V. & Placier, P. *Teacher Change*
       Or
   Shepard, L. A. *The Role of Classroom Assessment in Teaching and Learning* (Both are handouts*)*

Outline your chapter individually and make copies for the class.
(Outlines will look different for different readers; this is intentional.)

Week 5   **Methods vs. Models: Revisiting Core and Essentials**
                    Matrix, continued
                    Analyzing and Observing Teaching (yours and others): Video tools

   Readings: Daniels and Bizar, Chapters 1 – 4

Week 6   **Methods vs. Models: Revisiting Core and Essentials**
                    Matrix, continued
                    Analyzing and Observing Teaching (yours and others): Video tools

   Readings: Daniels and Bizar, Chapters 5 – 8 & Gamoran Sherin and van Es. *A New Lens on Teaching: Learning to Notice* (Handout)

Week 7   **Research Regarding Online Teaching Part One**

   Readings: Hiltz and Goldman – Each participant will read one chapter from <u>Part 1: Foundations of Research on Learning Networks</u> (to be determined in class)
                                    &
   Due: One-two page summary and critical analysis of your Hiltz and Goldman chapters. Please make copies of this summary for class members and instructor.

Week 8   **Research Regarding Online Teaching Part Two**

   Readings: Hiltz and Goldman – Each participant will read one chapter from <u>Part   2: What We Know and What We Need to Know</u> (to be determined in class)

   Due: One-two page summary and critical analysis of your Hiltz and Goldman chapters. Please make copies of this summary for class members and instructor.

   Due: Video #1 - 10 minute slice and analysis (per rubric)

Week 9   **Analyzing teaching through the study of student work**

   Readings: McDonald, Mohr, Dichter and McDonald, Chapters 1, 2, 5

Week 10   **Analyzing teaching through the study of student work**

   Readings: McDonald, et al, Chapters 3, 4

Week 11   **Analyzing teaching through video: What we have learned and what we
                    Need to learn**

   No Reading assignment

   Due: Video #2 – 10 minute slice and analysis (per rubric)

Week 12   **Analyzing teaching through the study of student work**

          BRING: 4 copies of a single student's work, name removed, that you would like to use for your student work protocol exercise. We will use the <u>Collaborative Assessment Protocol</u> in class to address your student work sample in small groups –

          Due: Student Work Presentation using the Collaborative Assessment Protocol - (Follow up written analysis is due next week)

Week 13   **Conclusions we can and can't draw about teaching from Student Work Implications for Instructional Practice derived from Student Work**

          DUE – YOUR ANALYSIS OF THE STUDENT WORK SESSION ON YOUR PRESENTED WORK FROM LAST WEEK

Week 14   **Analyzing teaching through the study of student work**

          BRING: 4 copies of student work or other curriculum material that you would like to use for your student work protocol exercise. This time, you will select which protocol you would like to us to use. Be prepared with copies of the protocol, or refer us to the appropriate protocol in McDonald, et al.

          Due: Student Work Presentation Using a Protocol from the materials and readings of your choice (Tuning, Collaborative Assessment or other) (Follow up analysis is due next week)

Week 15

          DUE – YOUR ANALYSIS OF THE STUDENT WORK SESSION ON YOUR PRESENTED WORK FROM LAST WEEK

          In-class synthesis: **Two videos and two student work follow up analyses = Research-based Profile of core instructional practices**
          Course evaluations

Assignments

1) Richard/Placier OR Shepard article outline (10)

    (10 Hiltz and Goldman chapter summaries, parts 1 and 2+ 10)
2) Video #1 – slice and analysis (45)

3) Video #2 – slice and analysis (45)

4) Student work protocol analysis (40)

5) Student work protocol analysis (40)
   TOTAL POINTS: 200

As doctoral students, you are of course expected to read all assigned readings and come to class prepared with specific Talking Points to help guide the discussion. The Talking Points may either be written or highlighted.

Four Main Topic Areas for EDF 7758

Models and Methods for Core Instructional Practices

Research Regarding Technology and Online Teaching Tools

Video Observation/Analysis in order to Understand and Improve Teaching

Analyzing Student Work in order to Understand and Improve Teaching

Assignment Descriptions

Chapter Outlines and summaries (Richardson/Placier or Shepard & two Hiltz and Goldman chapters)

These assignments are intended to contribute to your 'data bank' of research and theory regarding teaching and instructional practices. Sharing highlights via outlines and summaries will help you be deeply familiar with part of the reading, while sharing access to general ideas for parts you were not assigned. This group collection method should assist you in studying for qualifying examinations as well as contribute to your general knowledge base as researchers and doctoral students.

VIDEO SLICE ASSIGNMENTS (VIDEO # 1 AND VIDEO #2)

We will develop a rubric for these assignments. In general, you are asked to videotape yourself teaching a lesson and then choosing a maximum of ten minutes from that video that best illustrates your method or model. You will use the readings, particularly the Eggen/Kauchak and the Daniels/Bizar texts as frames for specific methods or models. You will also be introduced to specific tools and instruments that allow you to quantitatively and qualitatively analyze your video.

The video slice will also address a specific inquiry question regarding understanding and improving your teaching. We will begin thinking about possible inquiry questions on the first night of class. Here are some prompts to consider as you plan your videos:

What question do you hope to answer about your teaching through a careful observational analysis?
What troubles you about your teaching right now?
What do you need to work on?
What are the 'critical incidents' in a typical teaching session for you?
If you have videotaped teaching before, what do you notice? What can you learn by watching?
What method or model from the two core texts intrigues you?
What method or model might you like to try?
What method or model are you comfortable with – too comfortable with, perhaps?
What method or model do you feel you are most accomplished with? How do you know that you are successful with that method or model?

STUDENT WORK ANALYSIS/FOLLOW UPS (# 1 AND #2)
A criteria checklist will be provided for these assignments.

Research on teaching indicates that teachers can learn much about what they do simply by analyzing what their students do – on projects, work sheets, tests, writing essays, art work, class notes, etc. Samples, of course, should be rich enough to evoke conversation or should be focused on a problem or challenge that you are finding in your teaching.

For this class, you will be asked to collect student work in two ways. For the first assignment (Student Work Analysis/Followup #1, you are asked to bring a sample of just one student's work and we will follow a specific protocol called the Collaborative Assessment Conference protocol to examine it, discuss it, and provide you with data. You will then take those notes from the CAC and write a reflective follow up.

The second Student Work Analysis/Follow Up assignment can be a different type of sample – a lesson plan, a set of work from several students, or a worksheet/ assessment, etc. that you are developing or have developed. You will also choose the specific protocol from those described in the readings and handouts you wish us to use for this second assignment looking at student work.

As with the video assignments, you should be prepared to address a specific inquiry question that you have about your teaching and your students' learning through these analyses of work. More detail on this later in class and in your readings.

GRADING SCALE: This course utilizes FAU's Suggested Grading Scale:

A	93-100	B-	80-82	D+	67-69
A-	90-92	C+	77-79	D	63-66
B+	87-89	C	73-76	D-	60-62
B	83-86	C-	70-72	F	Below 60

TEACHING METHODOLOGIES

Lecture   Modeling   Research   Discussion   Presentations   Cooperative Groups
Electronic Communication including E-Mail; Blackboard (e.g., discussion board, digital dropbox; SafeAssign)
Audiovisual support (video, DVD, overhead projector, computer, Internet)

AUDIO/VISUAL TECHNOLOGY

- Use your FAU E-Mail Address (check frequently). Go to MyFAU to obtain your e-mail address.
- Blackboard site: Http://Blackboard.fau.edu, bb.fau.edu, or use link under Current students' tab.
- Research using FAU library, Internet browser, professional organizations, government websites
- Computers with word processing, presentation software, and high-speed Internet access are available in all campus computer and library labs. Files may be printed, saved, or e-mailed.

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (A.D.A.), students who require special accommodations due to a disability to properly execute coursework must register with the Office for Students with Disabilities (OSD) located in Boca - SU 133 (561-297-3880), in Davie - MOD I (954-236-1222), or in Jupiter SR 117 (561-799-8585) and follow all OSD procedures. The purpose of this office "is to provide reasonable accommodations to students with disabilities." Students who require assistance should notify the professor immediately by **submitting a letter from the Disabilities Office to your instructor** requesting your need of specific assistance. Without such letter, the instructor is not obligated to make any accommodations for students.

EXPECTATIONS

Attending Florida Atlantic University is a privilege. Professional conduct is expected and includes, but is not limited to, showing respect to colleagues and the instructor; being on time for class; completing assignments prior to entering class; preparing assignments with substantive content and accurate spelling, grammar, and mechanics; and displaying a positive interest in class.

Electronic Devices
Use of any electronic devices in the classroom should be limited to the content and activities taking place at that time. Inappropriate use of such devices may result in removal from the classroom, a reduction in your grade, or some other consequence, as determined by the professor.

Bringing Children or Guests to Class
Because of safety and liability issues, minor children are not permitted in class or in the hallways during class time. Other class visitors must be approved by instructor in advance.

Punctuality, Attendance, and Participation
- Students are expected to be on time and to remain for the duration of each class session. Since late arrivals and early departures are disruptive, they will be treated as absences and may affect your grade.
- Students are expected to attend all of their scheduled university classes and to satisfy all academic objectives as outlined by the instructor. The effect of absences upon grades is determined by the instructor, and the University reserves the right to deal at any time with individual cases of nonattendance. Attendance includes active involvement in all class sessions, class discussions, and class activities, as well as professional conduct in class. Points may be deducted for missing or failing to participate in some or all of a class session. Students are responsible for getting class notes/handouts from peers and making up any missed written assignments. Approval for making up any missed work and setting a new deadline must be granted by the instructor before work is submitted.
- Students are responsible for arranging to make up work missed because of legitimate class absence, such as illness, family emergencies, military obligation, court-imposed legal obligations, or participation in University-sponsored activities (such as athletic or scholastic team, musical and theatrical performances, and debate activities). It is the student's responsibility to give the instructor notice prior to any anticipated absence, and within a

reasonable amount of time after an unanticipated absence, ordinarily by the next scheduled class meeting. Instructors must allow each student who is absent for a University-approved reason the opportunity to make up work missed without any reduction in the student's final course grade as a direct result of such absence.

Religious Accommodation
- In accordance with rules of the Florida Board of Education and Florida law, students have the right to reasonable accommodations from the University in order to observe religious practices and beliefs with regard to admissions, registration, class attendance, and the scheduling of examinations and work assignments.
- Students who wish to be excused from course work, class activities, or examinations must notify the instructor in advance of their intention to participate in religious observation and request an excused absence. The instructor will provide a reasonable opportunity to make up such excused absences.
- Any student who feels aggrieved regarding religious accommodations may present a grievance to the director of Equal Opportunity Programs. Any such grievances will follow Florida Atlantic University's established grievance procedure regarding alleged discrimination.

LiveText
Students in this course are required by the College of Education to have an active LiveText account to track mastery of programs skills, competencies and critical assignments and to meet program and college accreditation requirements. Students must have an account within: the first four (4) weeks of the fall or spring semester, within the first three (3) weeks of summer session, or after the first class of a fast track course. Students who do not have an active LiveText account may have an academic hold placed on their record. Information regarding account activation is provided on the College of Education website, http://coe.fau.edu/livetext.

Dropping the Course
In order to withdraw from a course, it is not sufficient to stop attending class or to inform the instructor of your intention to withdraw. In accordance with university policy, students wishing to withdraw from a course must do so formally through the Registrar's office. It is the students' responsibility to complete all forms. If this is not done, the instructor must assign a grade of F at the end of the semester. **FALL 2010**: "W" drop day is September 3; "F" Drop day is October 15.

Academic Honesty
Students at Florida Atlantic University are expected to maintain the highest ethical standards. Academic dishonesty, including cheating and plagiarism, is considered a serious breach of these ethical standards, because it interferes with the University mission to provide a high quality education in which no student enjoys an unfair advantage over any other. Academic dishonesty is also destructive of the University community, which is grounded in a system of mutual trust and places high value on personal integrity and individual responsibility. Harsh penalties are associated with academic dishonesty, which may include an "F" on the assignment, an "F" in the course, or even removal from the degree program.

➢ Florida Atlantic University Regulation 4.001, "Honor Code, Academic Irregularities, and Student's Academic Grievances" is strictly adhered to in this course (http://www.fau.edu/regulations/chapter4/4.001_Honor_Code.pdf.). The regulation states: (1) Academic irregularities frustrate the efforts of the faculty and serious students to meet University goals. Since faculty, students and staff have a stake in these goals, the responsibility of all is to discourage academic irregularities by preventative measures and by insuring that appropriate action is taken when irregularities are discovered. Thus, FAU has an honor code requiring a faculty member, student or staff member to notify an Instructor when there is reason to believe an academic irregularity is occurring in a course. The Instructor's duty is to pursue any reasonable allegation, taking action, as described below, where appropriate. (2) The following shall constitute academic irregularities:
   (a) The use of notes, books or assistance from or to other students while taking an examination or working on other assignments unless specifically authorized by the Instructor are defined as acts of cheating.
   (b) The presentation of words or ideas from any other source as one's own – an act defined as plagiarism.
   (c) Other activities which interfere with the educational mission within the classroom.

➢ In the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (APA), plagiarism is defined as:
   Plagiarism (Principle 6.22). Psychologists do not claim the words and ideas of another as their own; they give credit where credit is due. Quotation marks should be used to indicate the exact words of another. Each time you paraphrase another author (i.e., summarize a passage or rearrange the order of a sentence and change some of the words), you will need to credit the source in the text.

All sources used must be cited, referenced, and listed in the appropriate bibliography/ materials list. Be especially careful about cutting and pasting text from websites. You may not do so without using quotation marks (or indented block quote for 40 words or more) for the text and citing the source. Be sparing in your use of online quotes.

Department of Curriculum, Culture, and Educational Inquiry
College of Education
Florida Atlantic University

COURSE TITLE: EDF 7917, Instructional Policies and the Teaching Profession

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Participants examine the current political, economic, and social challenges and dilemmas for the teaching profession. The course includes analysis of teacher certification trends, teacher education models, and research on teacher learning.

COURSE CONNECTION TO CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This course enables participants to be *informed* about the policies, practices and research that directly affect the teaching profession. Participants will be challenged to consider ethical implications of mandates, legislative initiatives, and policies affecting teachers and teaching while they examine their own role as leaders and scholars in the profession. Participants will become more *capable* researchers and persuasive contributors to policy making, as they plan research, conceptualize, and strategize positive change proposals to improve instruction and contribute to an ethical profession.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

Participants will:

1. Develop a concept map of what they have learned in the course regarding policies and practices in teaching (EAP 3.2).
2. Understand a research framework for each of the knowledge and practice areas that constitute the professional knowledge base for teachers. (EAP 3.2, 7.2)
3. Plan and practice teacher leadership as discussion facilitation. (EAP 8.1)
4. Review current research studies in a relevant teaching domain and develop a persuasive power point targeted for policy makers. (EAP 2.2, 4.2)
5. Develop a research-based narrative targeted for teachers to develop and use best practices in a professional context. (EAP 2.2, 4.2)
6. Assess elements of effective teacher education programs with respect to research on teacher learning and teacher development. (EAP 1.2)

REQUIRED TEXTS

Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (Eds.) (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Fuhrman, S. H., Cohen, D. K., & Mosher, F. (2007). *The state of education policy research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

And/or

Richardson, V. (Ed.) (2001). *Handbook of research on teaching* (4th ed.). Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

Additional readings as assigned by Instructor.

COURSE SCHEDULE

Week 1   **Introduction to course and topics, Building Criteria for assignments**

Readings: Darling-Hammond & Bransford, Preface, Committee, and Contributing Authors & Chapter 1

Week 2   **Instructional Practices: Expertise and Expert Teachers**

Readings: Berliner, D. C. (2001). Learning about and learning from expert teachers. *International Journal of Educational Research, 5*(35), 463-482.

Week 3   **What is Policy?**
            What is the relationship between policy, instructional practice, and research?

Readings: Fuhrman, Cohen, & Mosher, Preface, Contributors, & Chapter 1

Week 4   **Policy Issues Related to Instructional Practices**

Readings: Fuhrman, et al – Chapters 2,3,4 - The Making and Effects of Education Policy

Week 5   **Instructional Practices in Diversity: Practice, Research, and Policy Recommendations**

Readings: Jigsaw Expert Groups: DH and Bransford – Chapters 3,4,7

Week 6   **Teacher Learning/Teacher Knowledge**
            "The Teacher Quality Problem"

Readings: Darling-Hammond & Bransford, Chapter 2, 6 & 10

Week 7   **Teacher Quality, Highly Qualified Teachers**

Readings: SREB and National Board Certification article
            06E09-NationalBoardCertification.pdf

            Teacher Quality report Title 2 USDOE
            2004Title2-Report.pdf

Week 8   **Ninety minute DISCUSSION LEADERS**:

DUE: **White Paper (see criteria)**

Week 9   K-12 Teacher Education: Issues of Design and Practice

Readings: D-H and B: Chapter 11 Design of Teacher Education Programs & Chapter 12, Teacher Education, Organizational and Policy Change

Week 10   Model Teacher Education Programs, Induction Programs, Instructional Practices in Use

Readings: Selected overviews of model programs (web-based and interviews)

Week 11   Alternative Certification and Teacher Preparation

Readings: Humphrey, D. C., & Wechsler, M. E. (2005). Insights into alternative certification: Initial findings from a national study.

DUE: **Persuasive Power Point (see criteria)**

Week 12   Policy Issues and Scale: Classroom, District, State, and Federal

Readings: Fuhrman, et al – Chapters 14, 15

Week 13   Policy Issues (continued) Higher Education and Instructional Practices

Readings: Chapter 16 – Fuhrman, et al

Week 14   Teacher Learning and Learning Communities Research

Readings: Web Quest and Local District Investigation

Week 15   Teacher Community Research and Implications for Policy

Readings: Grossman, P., & Woolworth, S. (2001). Toward a theory of teacher community. *Teachers College Record, 103*(6), 942-1012. (on Blackboard)

Fuhrman, et al – Chapters 11 – 13 and Commentary by Carol Weiss

DUE: Concept Map – Your Learning and the "Four Pillars" of this course (see criteria)

COURSE ASSESSMENTS

1) Model Teacher Education Report (Course Objective 5)

Wheelock College
Bank Street College of Education
Alverno College
University of Southern Maine
Teachers College Columbia Teacher Education Program
Stanford University's Teacher Education Program
Michigan State University's Teacher Education Program

University of Wisconsin's Teacher Education Program
Illinois State University's Teacher Education Program
University of Santa Cruz New Teacher Project
California's Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program
Connecticut's Beginning Teacher Support and Training Program
Induction Program in Rochester, NY
Induction Program in Columbus, Ohio

Criteria for Model Teacher Education Report
Maximum of 2-3 pages – please provide copies (or email) to peers in class

____5____   Clear, concise overview of main characteristics of the program(s)

____5____   Your identification of unique elements of the program(s)

____5____   Your analysis of why the program(s) is considered a 'model'

2) White Paper
    What is a White Paper? The term white paper is an offshoot of the term white book, which is an official publication of a national government. A famous white paper example is the Winston Churchill White Paper of 1922, which addressed political conflict in Palestine.
        A white paper typically argues a specific position or solution to a problem. Although white papers take their roots in governmental policy, they have become a common tool used to introduce innovations and products.
Know Your Audience
        Perhaps the biggest mistake white paper writers make involves not properly understanding the disposition of their readers. For the purposes of this assignment, your audience is experienced teachers who are required to read and respond to your white paper as part of their professional development. Review the texts for our class regarding teacher learning and be sure to use what you read in the development of this white paper.
        A white paper must quickly identify problems or concerns faced by its readers and lead them down the path to a solution. Different types of readers look at the same problems from different perspectives. Teachers usually are very busy and this may mean that they have extremely short attention spans, an important consideration when writing to this type of audience. If you do not grab the reader's attention in the first paragraph, you will never achieve your objectives. There are really only two ways to write white papers: (1) by focusing on your self-interests or (2) by concentrating on the interests of your readers.   Do the latter for this assignment.
http://www.stelzner.com/copy-g-HowTo-whitepapers.php
        You must use at least 10 references, including your two textbooks. You must go to the original references for information, if those references were found as secondary sources in your texts. The audience for your White Paper is teachers or instructors at the community college/higher education level.

Best Practice White Paper Topic Options
Curriculum integration as a means toward student achievement
ELL innovations and best practices

Assessment innovation and current research
Subject matter knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and quality teaching
Mentoring new teachers as a means of retaining quality teachers
Teacher evaluation (research-based) that contributes to high quality teaching
New research on developmentally appropriate practice and how to apply it
Collaboration as a means of improving teaching
Teacher leadership and school reform
Feedback and quality teaching
Expertise and quality teaching

Criteria for Best Practices White Paper

____10____	Clear identification of problem(s) or questions being addressed by the paper
____10_____	Specific data-based discussion of context for this problem (i.e., this community, this county, this state)
____10_____	Clear identification of convincing reforms/changes suggested by the research (do not be limited by what is; rather, propose what should be)
____10_____	Clear proposal for action aimed at your audience of teachers or instructors (identified by level)
____10_____	Appropriate application of specifics from at least 10 references related to the topic

3) Persuasive Power Point (Course Objective 4)

Much of this course focuses on audiences for research, policy, and practice. <u>For this assignment, your audience is the School Board, Board of Trustees, and your immediate supervisors/administrators.</u> Power Points should be no less than 35 and no more than 50 slides. For your in-class session (October 6), you should select between 6 and 10 of those slides to share and talk from for a persuasive presentation lasting no more than 15 minutes. For this assignment, you are asked to draw on what you are learning about policy and policy making in this course.

Please choose from the list unless you have received permission from instructor for an alternative project. The topics are intentionally broad; you must choose a focus, a target problem that has policy implications for decision makers to act upon.

For both this assignment and the White Paper assignment, you will want to choose topics that will stretch your knowledge of the curriculum and instruction topics you are not already very familiar with and should be prepare for to succeed on the Qualifying Examinations. Note: do not focus on the same topic for the White Paper and the Persuasive Power Point.

> **POWER POINT TOPIC OPTIONS**:
>
> *Accountability*
> *Learning Communities, building community among teaching professionals*
> *Retention/teacher labor market*
> *Evidence-Based practice*
> *Equity and research-based practices*
> *Teacher quality*

Criteria for Persuasive Power Point Presentation

_____5_____	Appropriate selection of target slides; appropriate use of maximum of 15 minutes; well planned presentation
_____10_____	Background, statement of the problem you are posing
_____10_____	Convincing, data-based rationale for posing the problem to the decision makers present (i.e., why should they care?)
_____15_____	Research-based solutions to the problem posed, appropriate for this context, this community, this policy making entity
_____10____	Persuasive use of data/references

4) Concept Map (Course Objective 1,2) A concept map is a technique for representing knowledge in networks of concepts. Networks consist of points and links. <u>A concept map allows you to categorize your thinking, associate ideas, and indicate what you believe are major and minor ideas</u>.   You are encouraged to explore models and examples of concept maps on the Internet.

Taking four major themes of this course (**Teacher Learning, Teacher Community, Teacher Education, Education Policy Research)**, you will construct your own, individualized concept map synthesizing your knowledge and understanding of these themes. No two concept maps will look alike. This should be viewed as an ongoing assignment that you will build using readings and our in-class discussions after/during each class. Use of software, such as Inspiration, for this task is encouraged, though not required. Maps will be shared in class on October 20.

Concept Maps for EDG 7917 – Criteria Checklist

20 points:
1. _____Does the map focus on a **Big Idea** or **Essential Question?**

2. _____Does the map accommodate sufficient specifics about the four main themes of the

     course?

20 points:

3. _____ Does the map show **connections** between what you are learning as content, skills,

     or concepts?

4. _____ Does the map show connections <u>as</u>:

     Linear ? (arrows, straight lines, flow charts)

          OR **Circular** ? OR **Recurrent** ?

          OR **Some of each of the above**?

5. _____ Does the map indicate the **importance** of different activities or concepts

through size of the words, the shapes, the symbols? (The larger the

representation, the more important the concept, idea, or skill, in your view)

10 points:

6. _____ Is the map **easily read and interpreted**, even for professionals new to these

topics?

7. _____ Is the map **interesting** to look at? Engaging? Aesthetically appealing? Fun?

8. _____ Does the map **invite conversation**?

5) Discussion Facilitation: Planning and Leading a 90 minute session on the Readings (Course Objective 6). While the readings are guides, do not feel that you need to be limited to them or by them. You are the facilitator; you cannot necessarily rely on the fact that your peers will have read those chapters, but you can use the chapter(s)/articles as a basis for rich discussion that goes beyond the readings. If readings noted are not in the text, they will be provided on Blackboard. Use this opportunity to build your discussion and teaching skills with adults; that is the purpose. Only one facilitator/discussion leader per topic please. If more topics are needed, more will be provided.

Criteria for Discussion Leader Planning and Facilitation

_____10_____ Engagement and participation of peers

_____5 ____ Evidence of planning/shared agenda for 90 minute session

_____5_____ Clear goals for discussion

_____5_____ Mini-lesson by facilitator on the topic/big ideas/essential questions

_____5_____ Discussion of application of participant learning; next steps

post-discussion

_____5_____ Clarity, pacing/use of 90 minute block, constructive listening, effective use of

texts during interaction session

Grading

Model Teacher Education Program	**15 pts.**
White Paper: Best Practice Research	**50 pts.**
Discussion Leadership -- planning and facilitation	**35 pts.**
Persuasive Power Point – planning and presentation	**50 pts.**
Concept Map of Teacher Knowledge Research Framework	**50 pts.**

_____

TOTAL   **200 pts.**

GRADING SCALE: This course utilizes FAU's Suggested Grading Scale:

A	93-100	B-	80-82	D+	67-69
A-	90-92	C+	77-79	D	63-66
B+	87-89	C	73-76	D-	60-62
B	83-86	C-	70-72	F	Below 60

REFERENCES

Andrew, M. D., & Schwab, R. L. (1995). Has reform in teacher education influenced teacher performance? An outcome assessment of graduates of an eleven-university consortium. *Action in Teacher Education, XVII*(3), 41-53.

Angelle, P. S. (2006). Instructional leadership and monitoring: Increasing teacher intent to stay through socialization. *NASSP Bulletin, 90*(4), 318-334.

Bachar, P., & Glaubman, R. (2006). Policy and practice of art teaching in schools as perceived by educators and artists. *Arts Education Policy Review, 108*(1), 3–13.

Barry, B. (2005). Teacher quality and the question of preparation. *Education Week*, October 18, 32, 34.

Berliner, D. C. (2001). Learning about and learning from expert teachers. *International Journal of Educational Research, 35*, 463-482.

Beginning teacher induction: The essential bridge. (2001). *AFT Educational Issues Policy Brief, 13*.

Borman, K. M. (Ed.). (2004). *International Journal of Educational Policy, Research, & Practice, 5*(1).

Buckingham, J. (2003). Class size and teacher quality. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice, 2*, 71-86.

Burton, S. L., & Greher, G. R. (2007). School-University partnerships: What do we know and why do they matter? *Arts Education Policy Review, 109*(1), 13-22.

Christensen, C. R., Garvin, D. A., & Sweet, A. (Eds.). (1991). *Education for judgment: The artistry of discussion leadership*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. *Review of Research in Education, 24* (1), 249-305.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Zeichner, K. M. (Eds.). (2005). *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Securing the right to learn: Policy and practice for powerful teaching and learning. *Educational Researcher, 35*(7), 13-24.

Diez, M. E. (2007). Looking back and moving forward: Three tensions in the teacher dispositions discourse. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*(5), 388-396.

Ehrenberg, R. G., Jakubson, G. H., Green, J. A., So, E., & Price, J. (2007). Inside the black box of doctoral education: What program characteristics influence doctoral students' attrition and graduation probabilities. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 29*(2), 134-150.

Feeney, E. J. (2007). Quality feedback: The essential ingredient for teacher success. *The Clearinghouse, 80*(4), 191-197.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). Helping novices learn to teach: Lessons from an exemplary support teacher. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(1), 17-30.

Fenstermacher, G. D. (1999). The knower and the known: The nature of knowledge in research on teaching. *Review of Research In Education, 20,* 3-56.

Green, J., & Luke, A. (Eds.). (2006). *Rethinking learning: What counts as learning and what learning counts*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Hartocollis, A. (2005, July 31). Teaching the teachers: Who needs education schools? *The New York Times*.

Hatch, T. (2006). *Into the classroom: Developing the scholarship of teaching and learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Houser, N. O. (2007). Problem posing in teacher education: A Freirian approach. *Action in Teacher Education, 29*(3), 43-49.

The induction of new teachers. (n.d.). *Promising practices: New ways to improve teacher quality*. Retrieved December 2, 2005, from U.S. Department of Education Web site: http://www.ed.gov/pubs/PromPractice/chapter5.html

Johnson, S. M. (1990). *Teachers at work*. New York: Harper Collins.

Kincheloe, J. L., Slattery, P., & Steinberg, S. R. (2000). *Contextualizing teaching*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Krovetz, M. L., & Arriaza, G. (2006). *Collaborative teacher leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (2004). *Teacher leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (2005). Teachers as leaders. *The Educational Forum, 69*(2), 151-162.

Little, J. W. (2003). Inside teacher community: Representations of classroom practice. *Teachers College Record*. Retrieved February 16, 2005, from Teachers College, Columbia University Web site: http://tcresord.org

Massell, D. (Ed.). (2000). The district role in building capacity: Four strategies. *Consortium for Policy Research in Education Policy Briefs, RB-32*.

McLaughlin, H. J., & Burnaford, T. E. (2007). Re-thinking the basis for "high quality" teaching: Teacher preparation in communities. In T. Townsend & R. Bates (Eds.), *Handbook of teacher education* (pp. 331-342). The Netherlands: Springer.

McLaughlin, M. W., & Oberman, I. (Eds.). (1996). *Teacher learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Neill, M. W. (2007). Highly qualified teachers: Provisions, problems & prospects. *Catalyst for Change, 34*(2), 3-10.

Novak, J. D., & Gowin, D. B. (1984). *Learning how to learn*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Paris, T. S., & Wengert, A. (2006). An examination of two teacher rating scales: What can they tell us about how well we teach? *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 33*(2), 110-112.

Pease-Alvarez, L., & Schecter, S. R. (Eds.). (2005). *Learning, teaching, and community*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Riordan, K. (Ed.). (2003). Teacher leadership as a strategy for instructional improvement: The case of the Merck Institute for Science Education. *Consortium for Policy Research in Education CPRE Research Report*.

Seidel, T., & Shavelson, R. J. (2007). Teaching effectiveness research in the past decade: The role of theory and research design in disentangling meta-analysis results. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(4), 454-499.

Sheridan-Thomas, H. K (2007). Making sense of multiple literacies: Exploring pre-service content area teachers' understandings and applications. *Reading Research and Instruction, 46*(2), 121-150.

Shulman, L. S. (2005). To dignify the profession of teaching. *Change, 37*(5), 21-29.

Spillane, J. P. (2005, Winter). Distributed leadership. *The Educational Forum, 69*(2), 143-150.

Stritikus, T. T., & Wiese, A. M. (2006). Reassessing the role of ethnographic methods in education policy research: Implementing bilingual education policy at local levels. *Teachers College Record, 108*(6), 1106-1131.

61

Weiss, I. R., & Pasley, J. D. (Eds.). (2006). Scaling up instructional improvement through teacher professional development: Insights from the local systemic change initiative. *Consortium for Policy Research in Education Policy Briefs, RB 44*.

Wilson, S. M., & Berne, J. (1999). Teacher learning and the acquisition of professional knowledge: An examination of research on contemporary professional development. *Review of Research in Education, 24*, 173-209.

Wood, D. (2007) Teachers' learning communities: Catalyst for change or a new infrastructure for the status quo? *Teachers College Record, 109*(3), 699-739.

Young, P. (2007). District induction policy and new teachers' experiences: An examination of local policy implementation in Connecticut. *Teachers College Record, 109*(4), 797-837.

TEACHING METHODOLOGIES

Lecture   Modeling   Research   Discussion   Presentations   Cooperative Groups
Electronic Communication including E-Mail; Blackboard (e.g., discussion board, SafeAssign)
Audiovisual support (video, DVD, overhead projector, computer, Internet)

AUDIO/VISUAL TECHNOLOGY

- Use your FAU E-Mail Address (check frequently). Go to MyFAU to obtain your e-mail address.
- Blackboard site: Http://Blackboard.fau.edu, bb.fau.edu, or use link under Current students' tab.
- Research using FAU library, Internet browser, professional organizations, government websites
- Computers with word processing, presentation software, and high-speed Internet access are available in all campus computer and library labs. Files may be printed, saved, or e-mailed.

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (A.D.A.), students who require special accommodations due to a disability to properly execute coursework must register with the Office for Students with Disabilities (OSD) located in Boca - SU 133 (561-297-3880), in Davie - MOD I (954-236-1222), or in Jupiter SR 117 (561-799-8585) and follow all OSD procedures. The purpose of this office "is to provide reasonable accommodations to students with disabilities." Students who require assistance should notify the professor immediately by **submitting a letter from the Disabilities Office to your instructor** requesting your need of specific assistance. Without such letter, the instructor is not obligated to make any accommodations for students.

EXPECTATIONS

Attending Florida Atlantic University is a privilege. Professional conduct is expected and includes, but is not limited to, showing respect to colleagues and the instructor; being on time for class; completing assignments prior to entering class; preparing assignments with substantive content and accurate spelling, grammar, and mechanics; and displaying a positive interest in class.

Electronic Devices
Use of <u>any</u> electronic devices in the classroom should be limited to the content and activities taking place at that time. Inappropriate use of such devices may result in removal from the classroom, a reduction in your grade, or some other consequence, as determined by the professor.

Bringing Children or Guests to Class
Because of safety and liability issues, minor children are not permitted in class or in the hallways during class time. Other class visitors must be approved by instructor in advance.

Punctuality, Attendance, and Participation
- Students are expected to be on time and to remain for the duration of each class session. Since late arrivals and early departures are disruptive, they will be treated as absences and may affect your grade.
- Students are expected to attend all of their scheduled university classes and to satisfy all academic objectives as outlined by the instructor. The effect of absences upon grades is determined by the instructor, and the University reserves the right to deal at any time with individual cases of nonattendance. Attendance includes active involvement in all class sessions, class discussions, and class activities, as well as professional conduct in class. Points may be deducted for missing or failing to participate in some or all of a class session. Students are responsible for getting class notes/handouts from peers and making up any missed written assignments. Approval for making up any missed work and setting a new deadline must be granted by the instructor before work is submitted.
- Students are responsible for arranging to make up work missed because of legitimate class absence, such as illness, family emergencies, military obligation, court-imposed legal obligations, or participation in University-sponsored activities (such as athletic or scholastic team, musical and theatrical performances, and debate activities). It is the student's responsibility to give the instructor notice prior to any anticipated absence, and within a reasonable amount of time after an unanticipated absence, ordinarily by the next scheduled class meeting. Instructors must allow each student who is absent for a University-approved reason the opportunity to make up work missed without any reduction in the student's final course grade as a direct result of such absence.

Religious Accommodation
- In accordance with rules of the Florida Board of Education and Florida law, students have the right to reasonable accommodations from the University in order to observe religious practices and beliefs with regard to admissions, registration, class attendance, and the scheduling of examinations and work assignments.
- Students who wish to be excused from course work, class activities, or examinations must notify the instructor in advance of their intention to participate in religious observation and

request an excused absence. The instructor will provide a reasonable opportunity to make up such excused absences.

- Any student who feels aggrieved regarding religious accommodations may present a grievance to the director of Equal Opportunity Programs. Any such grievances will follow Florida Atlantic University's established grievance procedure regarding alleged discrimination.

LiveText
Students in this course are required by the College of Education to have an active LiveText account to track mastery of programs skills, competencies and critical assignments and to meet program and college accreditation requirements. Students must have an account within: the first four (4) weeks of the fall or spring semester, within the first three (3) weeks of summer session, or after the first class of a fast track course. Students who do not have an active LiveText account may have an academic hold placed on their record. Information regarding account activation is provided on the College of Education website, http://coe.fau.edu/livetext.

Dropping the Course
In order to withdraw from a course, it is not sufficient to stop attending class or to inform the instructor of your intention to withdraw. In accordance with university policy, students wishing to withdraw from a course must do so formally through the Registrar's office. It is the students' responsibility to complete all forms. If this is not done, the instructor must assign a grade of F at the end of the semester. **FALL 2010**: "W" drop day is Sept. 3; "F" Drop day is Oct. 15.

Academic Honesty
Students at Florida Atlantic University are expected to maintain the highest ethical standards. Academic dishonesty, including cheating and plagiarism, is considered a serious breach of these ethical standards, because it interferes with the University mission to provide a high quality education in which no student enjoys an unfair advantage over any other. Academic dishonesty is also destructive of the University community, which is grounded in a system of mutual trust and places high value on personal integrity and individual responsibility. Harsh penalties are associated with academic dishonesty, which may include an "F" on the assignment, an "F" in the course, or even removal from the degree program.

➢ Florida Atlantic University Regulation 4.001, "Honor Code, Academic Irregularities, and Student's Academic Grievances" is strictly adhered to in this course (http://www.fau.edu/regulations/chapter4/4.001_Honor_Code.pdf.). The regulation states: (1) Academic irregularities frustrate the efforts of the faculty and serious students to meet University goals. Since faculty, students and staff have a stake in these goals, the responsibility of all is to discourage academic irregularities by preventative measures and by insuring that appropriate action is taken when irregularities are discovered. Thus, FAU has an honor code requiring a faculty member, student or staff member to notify an Instructor when there is reason to believe an academic irregularity is occurring in a course. The Instructor's duty is to pursue any reasonable allegation, taking action, as described below, where appropriate.
(2) The following shall constitute academic irregularities:
  (a) The use of notes, books or assistance from or to other students while taking an

examination or working on other assignments unless specifically authorized by the Instructor are defined as acts of cheating.

    (b) The presentation of words or ideas from any other source as one's own – an act defined as plagiarism.

    (c) Other activities which interfere with the educational mission within the classroom.

➢ In the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (APA), plagiarism is defined as:

    Plagiarism (Principle 6.22). Psychologists do not claim the words and ideas of another as their own; they give credit where credit is due. Quotation marks should be used to indicate the exact words of another. Each time you paraphrase another author (i.e., summarize a passage or rearrange the order of a sentence and change some of the words), you will need to credit the source in the text.

All sources used must be cited, referenced, and listed in the appropriate bibliography/materials list. <u>Be especially careful about cutting and pasting text from websites</u>. You may not do so without using quotation marks (or indented block quote for 40 words or more) for the text and citing the source. Be sparing in your use of online quotes.

Department of Curriculum, Culture, and Educational Inquiry
College of Education
Florida Atlantic University

COURSE TITLE: EDG 7938, Doctoral Seminar

COURSE CONNECTION TO CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The doctoral seminar introduces students to the professional field of teaching and research in curriculum and instruction. Students learn the *ethics of respect for Human Subjects in research* and *become informed about the sources for knowledge and information about research topics* of interest to them and to peers in the profession. *They become increasingly capable as researchers* to ask questions, pursue responses, and observe carefully in order to contribute to the knowledge base of the profession.

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course is designed to orient doctoral students to the nature of doctoral work in curriculum and instruction, scholarly productivity, and the technical requirements associated with conducting scholarly research (e.g., familiarization with publication format as outlined by the American Psychological Association, the requirements of the Division of Sponsored Research and the Institutional Review Board).

The course is also designed to increase student knowledge and understanding of the features associated with high quality doctoral dissertations and dissertation proposals in the field of curriculum and instruction. The course affords students the opportunity to investigate research interests and projects engaged in by faculty in order to plan for future apprenticeships, internships, and research assistantships in areas of interest.

Throughout the semester, we will read and discuss research studies and essays reflecting current issues in curriculum and instruction at the micro and macro level, in order to frame current and future investigations in teaching and learning. .

REQUIRED TEXTS

Author. (2007). *Publications Manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association

Burgess, H., Sieminski,S., & Arthur, L. (2006). *Achieving your doctorate in education*. London: Sage.

• There may be additional readings/articles added during the term. These will be duplicated and distributed or posted on Blackboard

COURSE OBJECTIVES

Class participants will:

1. Demonstrate an understanding of professional activity, resources, and ethical behavior (EAP6).
2. Participate in a variety of higher education experiences such as seminars, conferences, and research assistance to faculty (EAP 2, 3, 8, 11, & 12).
3. Identify characteristics of high quality doctoral dissertation, including aspects of qualitative and quantitative design (EAP 6, 3).
4. Demonstrate an understanding of the use of APA style of formatting scholarly papers (EAP8).
5. Conduct and analyze interviews about teachers' views of research, and College of Education faculty members' perspectives on research, teaching, and service (EAP 2, 3, &8).
6. Examine and discuss the procedures, styles, and content of research studies in the various academic content areas of curriculum and instruction (EAP 3, 4, & 8).

COURSE SCHEDULE

Week 1

Topic: **Introduction to the doctoral program and to our department**

Timeline and possible experiences during the program

Mapping curriculum and instruction:
- *Why should we do research?*
- *What are your conceptions of research?*
- *What are your research interests?*
- *What is a Research Question?*

Our Academic Glossary

Course overview

FAU Graduate Policies

Week 2

Topic: **DTE Doctoral Student Handbook and your Ed.D. Program**

Asking questions: About students, teaching, learning instruction, curriculum, parents, and the community Readings: Burgess et al., Chapters 1-2

Hubbard & Powers: *Try* to *Love the Questions Themselves*

"IQ": Information and Questions

What questions do you have about your students and their learning?

Teaching? Curriculum? Parents? School and community?

Virtual library Tour: Mr. Ken Frankel, Reference librarian, will conduct a virtual tour of

library resources in class.

Week 3

Topic: **Ethics and Theory in Research**

Develop Protocols for Active Interviews: Colleague Interviews and Faculty Research Interviews

Readings: Burgess et al., Chapters 3-5

Eisenhart & DeHaan: *Doctoral preparation of scientifically based education researchers*

Wollman-Bonilla: *Does Anybody Really Care?* Due: *Summary of scholarly journal*

Week 4

Topic: **Research Interviews; How do we analyze the interview data?**

Dissertation Search

Annotated Bibliography

Readings: Burgess et al., Chapters 6-8.

DUE: Organization, Conference and Journal Summary.

Week 5

Topic: **Academic formatting of your writing**

Dissertation Search

Annotated Bibliography

Reading: *APA Manual: Content and Organization of a Manuscript,* pp. 3-30 and *Journals Program of the APA,* pp. 345-361.

DUE: *Interview of 2 colleagues about their research and professional development perspectives (3-4 pages)*

Week 6

Topic: **Proposals for dissertation -**guidelines from FAU/COE

Dissertation Search

Annotated Bibliography

Week 7

Understanding the doctoral process and requirements

This class will be devoted to a dialogue with advanced FAU doctoral students in education. Some themes covered will be

1. Selecting a dissertation chair and committee.

2. Tips on library resources.

3. Dynamics within the doctoral committee.

4. Questions and answers.

DUE: Preliminary Annotated Bibliography (5 sources)

Week 8

Topic: **Research as a life-long endeavor**

DUE *University Faculty Interviews*

Week 9

Topic: Institutional Review Board Process/Research Compliance

IRB Proposal Format

DUE: Dissertation Analysis

Weeks 10-11

Topic: Follow-up on dissertations: Process and product

Follow-up on discussion of ethics in our profession

Week 12

Topic: **Academic writing**

What does research mean to administrators, curriculum coordinators, and the public?

Research and NCLB
Readings: Burgess, et al., Chapters 9-11
Due: *IRB Proposal or CITI Training Certificate*

Week 13

APA Summary Discussion

Due: *Annotated Bibliography on Research Interest/Area*

Week 14

APA Summary Discussion

Topic: **Teachers as Researchers**

Practitioners and Scholars: Boundaries and Bridges

Week 15

Topic: What we have learned this semester

Course Evaluations

ASSIGNMENTS

**<u>Organization, Conference, and Journal Summary</u> -due September 20 -Not graded
(Course Objective #1**) Two pages.

    Characteristics of the Professional Association

    Description of publications sponsored by the Association

    Benefits of Membership

    Description of the Conference

**<u>Interview of 2 Colleagues</u> (Minimum 2-page summary of each) -due Sept. 27
(Course Objective #5)**

    A. Focused Interview with 2 faculty colleagues /Rationale for selection

    B. Background on colleague: School and prior teaching experiences

                      Teaching areas/courses

    C. Interview Protocol

    D. Interview Responses from Colleague/Selected Quotations

    E. Summary of Colleagues' Perspectives on Research and Professional Development

APA Selected Topic Discussion (Course Objective # 4)

    Students will summarize a section from APA Manual

    Summaries and analysis of this section of the APA Manual will be shared with the whole class at designated class meetings.

Faculty Interview Paper -due Oct. 18 (Course Objective #5) (7-8 pages total)

    Rubric Assessment includes:

        A. Face-to-face Interview with 2 University faculty members /Rationale for selection

        B. Background on faculty member:

            Degree/awarding institution

            Dissertation

            Articles/books published in last 5 years

            Current research/scholarship

            Teaching areas/courses

            Service

        C. Interview Protocol (include in PowerPoint -will be adapted in class)

        D. Interview Responses from Faculty Members/Selected Quotations

        E. Student Response/Analysis/Connection to Research and Future Doctoral Research

Two Dissertation Analyses (2-3 pages each study) -due Oct. 25 (Course Objective #3)

    Address these questions in your write up:

        What topics were addressed?

        What research questions were asked?

        What research designs were used?

        How were the literature reviews organized?

        What questions do you have about the study?

        What have you learned that might help you design a proposal?

Annotated Bibliography: DUE Nov. 15. Preliminary (5 study analysis) due Oct. 11.

    This assignment is intended to familiarize the doctoral student with the analysis of research studies. Students will select one to three themes and find 15 research articles to analyze. The articles may describe quantitative, qualitative or mixed-methods research. Each research article analysis should include the following:

1. APA Bibliographic entry.
2. Research Question(s).
3. Methodology
4. Data Analysis
5. Findings

Students will turn in a preliminary (5 sources, 2 pages each) bibliography on Feb.24. These preliminary bibliographies will be given formative evaluation (feedback given but not applicable to the assignment's final grade). Then students will apply this feedback to the full assignment due April7. Please attach the preliminary bibliographies to the final full annotated bibliographies when you turn in the latter.

IRB "Practice" Proposal/ or CITI training certificate-due November 8 - Not graded - (Course Objective #1)

Annotated Bibliography -due Nov. 15 -Rubric Assessment (Course Objective #6)

GRADING

The Doctoral Seminar is a unique course in that grades represent your own progress in your investigation as a professional. To provide guidelines, however, each assignment has a Criteria Checklist or a Rubric, representing the minimum essentials required. Initial assignment grades will be given as A, B, or R *(must be revised).* In the event of an R grade on an initial assignment, the student will have one opportunity to revise the assignment. The grade on the second (revised) assignment will be final. The point value of each component of your final grade is listed below:

Participation	5 points	
Interview of Colleagues	10 points	(due Sept. 27)
Preliminary Annotated Bib./5 sources	-----------	(due Oct. 11)

University Faculty Interview	20 points	(due Oct. 18)
Dissertation Analyses	20 points	(due Oct. 25)
Annotated Bibliography	45 points	(due Nov. 15)

GRADING SCALE: This course utilizes FAU's Suggested Grading Scale:

A	93-100	B-	80-82	D+	67-69
A-	90-92	C+	77-79	D	63-66
B+	87-89	C	73-76	D-	60-62
B	83-86	C-	70-72	F	Below 60

Note: A grade of C or lower will mean the student has to repeat this course.

AUDIO/VISUAL TECHNOLOGY

- Use your FAU E-Mail Address (check frequently). Go to MyFAU to obtain your e-mail address.
- Blackboard site: Http://Blackboard.fau.edu, bb.fau.edu, or use link under Current students' tab.
- Research using FAU library, Internet browser, professional organizations, government websites
- Computers with word processing, presentation software, and high-speed Internet access are available in all campus computer and library labs. Files may be printed, saved, or e-mailed.

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (A.D.A.), students who require special accommodations due to a disability to properly execute coursework must register with the Office for Students with Disabilities (OSD) located in Boca - SU 133 (561-297-3880), in Davie - MOD I (954-236-1222), or in Jupiter SR 117 (561-799-8585) and follow all OSD procedures. The purpose of this office "is to provide reasonable accommodations to students with disabilities." Students who require assistance should notify the professor immediately by **submitting a letter from the Disabilities Office to your instructor** requesting your need of specific assistance. Without such letter, the instructor is not obligated to make any accommodations for students.

EXPECTATIONS

Attending Florida Atlantic University is a privilege. Professional conduct is expected and includes, but is not limited to, showing respect to colleagues and the instructor; being on time for class; completing assignments prior to entering class; preparing assignments with substantive content and accurate spelling, grammar, and mechanics; and displaying a positive interest in class.

Electronic Devices
Use of any electronic devices in the classroom should be limited to the content and activities taking place at that time. Inappropriate use of such devices may result in removal from the classroom, a reduction in your grade, or some other consequence, as determined by the professor.

Bringing Children or Guests to Class
Because of safety and liability issues, minor children are not permitted in class or in the hallways during class time. Other class visitors must be approved by instructor in advance.

Punctuality, Attendance, and Participation
- Students are expected to be on time and to remain for the duration of each class session. Since late arrivals and early departures are disruptive, they will be treated as absences and may affect your grade.
- Students are expected to attend all of their scheduled university classes and to satisfy all academic objectives as outlined by the instructor. The effect of absences upon grades is determined by the instructor, and the University reserves the right to deal at any time with individual cases of nonattendance. Attendance includes active involvement in all class sessions, class discussions, and class activities, as well as professional conduct in class. Points may be deducted for missing or failing to participate in some or all of a class session. Students are responsible for getting class notes/handouts from peers and making up any missed written assignments. Approval for making up any missed work and setting a new deadline must be granted by the instructor before work is submitted.
- Students are responsible for arranging to make up work missed because of legitimate class absence, such as illness, family emergencies, military obligation, court-imposed legal obligations, or participation in University-sponsored activities (such as athletic or scholastic team, musical and theatrical performances, and debate activities). It is the student's responsibility to give the instructor notice prior to any anticipated absence, and within a reasonable amount of time after an unanticipated absence, ordinarily by the next scheduled class meeting. Instructors must allow each student who is absent for a University-approved reason the opportunity to make up work missed without any reduction in the student's final course grade as a direct result of such absence.

Religious Accommodation
- In accordance with rules of the Florida Board of Education and Florida law, students have the right to reasonable accommodations from the University in order to observe religious practices and beliefs with regard to admissions, registration, class attendance, and the scheduling of examinations and work assignments.
- Students who wish to be excused from course work, class activities, or examinations must notify the instructor in advance of their intention to participate in religious observation and request an excused absence. The instructor will provide a reasonable opportunity to make up such excused absences.
- Any student who feels aggrieved regarding religious accommodations may present a grievance to the director of Equal Opportunity Programs. Any such grievances will follow Florida Atlantic University's established grievance procedure regarding alleged discrimination.

LiveText
Students in this course are required by the College of Education to have an active LiveText account to track mastery of programs skills, competencies and critical assignments and to meet program and college accreditation requirements. Students must have an account within: the first four (4) weeks of the fall or spring semester, within the first three (3) weeks of summer session,

or after the first class of a fast track course. Students who do not have an active LiveText account may have an academic hold placed on their record. Information regarding account activation is provided on the College of Education website, http://coe.fau.edu/livetext.

Dropping the Course
In order to withdraw from a course, it is not sufficient to stop attending class or to inform the instructor of your intention to withdraw. In accordance with university policy, students wishing to withdraw from a course must do so formally through the Registrar's office. It is the students' responsibility to complete all forms. If this is not done, the instructor must assign a grade of F at the end of the semester. **FALL 2010**: "W" drop day is September 3; "F" Drop day is October 15.

Academic Honesty
Students at Florida Atlantic University are expected to maintain the highest ethical standards. Academic dishonesty, including cheating and plagiarism, is considered a serious breach of these ethical standards, because it interferes with the University mission to provide a high quality education in which no student enjoys an unfair advantage over any other. Academic dishonesty is also destructive of the University community, which is grounded in a system of mutual trust and places high value on personal integrity and individual responsibility. Harsh penalties are associated with academic dishonesty, which may include an "F" on the assignment, an "F" in the course, or even removal from the degree program.

➢ Florida Atlantic University Regulation 4.001, "Honor Code, Academic Irregularities, and Student's Academic Grievances" is strictly adhered to in this course (http://www.fau.edu/regulations/chapter4/4.001_Honor_Code.pdf.). The regulation states: (1) Academic irregularities frustrate the efforts of the faculty and serious students to meet University goals. Since faculty, students and staff have a stake in these goals, the responsibility of all is to discourage academic irregularities by preventative measures and by insuring that appropriate action is taken when irregularities are discovered. Thus, FAU has an honor code requiring a faculty member, student or staff member to notify an Instructor when there is reason to believe an academic irregularity is occurring in a course. The Instructor's duty is to pursue any reasonable allegation, taking action, as described below, where appropriate.
(2) The following shall constitute academic irregularities:
   (a) The use of notes, books or assistance from or to other students while taking an examination or working on other assignments unless specifically authorized by the Instructor are defined as acts of cheating.
   (b) The presentation of words or ideas from any other source as one's own – an act defined as plagiarism.
   (c) Other activities which interfere with the educational mission within the classroom.

➢ In the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (APA), plagiarism is defined as:
   Plagiarism (Principle 6.22). Psychologists do not claim the words and ideas of another as their own; they give credit where credit is due. Quotation marks should be used to indicate the exact words of another. Each time you paraphrase another author (i.e., summarize a

passage or rearrange the order of a sentence and change some of the words), you will need to credit the source in the text.

All sources used must be cited, referenced, and listed in the appropriate bibliography/ materials list. <u>Be especially careful about cutting and pasting text from websites</u>. You may not do so without using quotation marks (or indented block quote for 40 words or more) for the text and citing the source. Be sparing in your use of online quotes.

Department of Curriculum, Culture, and Educational Inquiry
College of Education
Florida Atlantic University

COURSE TITLE: EDG 7944, Research in Curriculum and Instruction

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course provides an overview of research programs in curriculum and instruction, while offering students a structure and context for developing literature reviews for dissertation proposals.

PREREQUISITES

EDG 7938, EDG 7758, EDG 7917, EDG 7250. This course is intended to be taken during the last semester of course work prior to the qualifying examination in the doctoral program in Curriculum and Instruction.

COURSE CONNECTION TO THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This course enables participants to be *informed* about the research methodologies used in curriculum studies as well as the *ethical* considerations and implications of those studies with regard to effects on students, families, the school, and the community. Participants will become more *capable* educators, as they analyze the research quality of their own work as well as that of others.

REQUIRED TEXTS

Boote, D. N., & Beile, P. (2005). Scholars before researchers: On the centrality of the dissertation literature review in research preparation. *Educational Researcher, 34*(6), 3-15.

Bracey, G. W. (2006). *Reading educational research: How to avoid getting statistically snookered.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Connelly, F. M., He, M. F., & Phillion, J. (Eds.). (2008). *The Sage handbook of curriculum and instruction.* Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Galvan, J. L. (2006). *Writing literature reviews: A guide for students of the social and behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Pyrczak Publishing. (Or more recent edition is also useable)

Websites: APA Style Web Sites:
www.english.uiuc.edu/cws/wwrorkshop/bibliography/apa/apamenu.htm
AERA Web Site: www.aera.net

COURSE OBJECTIVES

The student will:

1. Analyze research from professional literature to evaluate findings. (EAP 3, 4, 7)
2. Engage in collaborative experiences with colleagues to identify the
    application(s) of research findings for divergent populations. (EAP 3, 4, 5,7)
3. Examine the ethical considerations of research protocols in various contexts. (EAP 3, 4, 6)
4. Synthesize research from the professional literature to identify significance of
    the findings. (EAP 3,4,7,8)
5. Articulate the trends and theoretical frameworks relevant to curriculum and
    instruction research. (EAP 3,4,7,8)

CLASS SCHEDULE

Week 1   **Topics**: Overview of Course
                Critical Reading of Research and Professional Literature
                Your literature review: Getting started
                "Six needs" (Connelly, He and Phillion reference)
                Dissertation Proposals, Chairs Q& A

Week 2   **Topics:** Your research questions/hypotheses + literature review subsections
                Trees and Clusters
                Evaluating literature reviews

                Reading: Boote, D. N., & Beile, P. (2005). Scholars before
                researchers: On the centrality of the   dissertation literature review in
                research preparation. *Educational Researcher, 34*(6), 3-15.

                (See Blackboard Course Documents; this article will be sent to your Chairs.)
                Galvan, Chapters 1-4

Week 3   **WE WILL MEET IN THE LIBRARY –
                ROOM 136 for RESEARCH GUIDANCE/SEARCH TIME**

                Topics: Selecting relevant research and theoretical citations

Week 4   **NO FORMAL CLASS MEETING – USE THIS TIME IN THE LIBRARY
                FOR LITERATURE REVIEW SEARCHES WITH LIBRARIAN
                ASSISTANCE AS NEEDED**

Week 5   **Topics:** The shape of literature reviews
                Synthesis and evaluation in literature reviews
                Analysis of literature reviews

                Reading: Galvan, Chapters 5-7

                DUE: Frequency chart of your selected topic

Week 6   **Topics:** Avoid Getting Snookered, Reading Others'
                Methodology and Understanding Their
                Results and Interpretations

          **DUE: Literature Review Critique - Use Boote and Beile collaborative checklist
          (We will develop this in class)**

                Reading: The Bracey book

Week 7   **Topic:** The larger field of Curriculum and Instruction:
                Contextualizing your Research: Where do you fit?

          Reading: INTRODUCTION to Sage Handbook, pp ix – xv,
                Author Index, Subject Index. About the Editors, About the Consulting
                Authors, About the Contributing Authors

                Galvan, chapters 8 – 13 (Remember that Galvan is not intended to be
                read cover to cover, but rather is a reference book. Consult as you
                prepare your literature as needed.

Week 8   **Topic:** Analyzing and Connecting Research Programs at Work:
                 Your Dissertation and Your C & I Colleagues in the Field

                Reading: Your SAGE Chapter Selection I Written Application
                and Analysis Response

                DUE: Search Citations for your Literature Review (<u>Minimum </u>of 45
                sources, arranged according to your subsection outline for your review.
                Please provide your research questions with the citations list.) (NOTE: This
                is a deadline for your citations list. You may of course add citations as you
                complete the review.)

Week 9   **Topic:** Literature Review Questions, Issues, Feedback
                 Returning to Galvan and Boote and Beile for criteria

                **DUE: One OR TWO sections of your literature review (minimum of
                15 citations per section) (This is ungraded at present. I will provide
                you with feedback and then this section will of course be incorporated
                into your final literature review.)**

Week 10   **Topic**: TBA based on your SAGE Reading Selections

          Reading: Your SAGE Chapter Selection II Written Application and Analysis
          Response

Week 11 **Topic:** Reviewing Research About Methodologies
Considering when you describe methodology as well as results in your literature review

DUE: Research Methodology(ies) literature review section (minimum of 5 citations). This is ungraded at present. I will provide you with feedback and then this section will of course be incorporated into your final literature review or chapter 3, at the discretion of you and your Chair)

Week 12 & 13 **Topic:** TBA based on your SAGE Chapter Selections

Reading: Your SAGE Chapter Selection III Written Application and Analysis Response

Weeks 14 & 15 **Topics:** Course Synthesis/Course Evaluation/Next Steps

Literature Review Conferences

DUE: Complete Literature Review

DUE: Six Slide Power Point Presentations of your scholarly process to develop this Literature Review and what your next steps will be to continue the literature investigation.

COURSE ASSESSMENTS

There are 5 assessments for this course. Note that the completed literature review is one-half of your grade.

1. Frequency Chart (10 points)

2. Literature Review Critique (20 points) due (criteria to be developed in class)

3. Sage Handbook Chapter Selections I, II, III: (20 points each x 3 = 60 points total)

Three Written Responses with respect to Application (Relevance to your Dissertation Topic and Literature Review/Analysis of Content

4. Dissertation Proposal 6-slide Power Point (10 points)
5. Dissertation Proposal Literature Review (Chapter 2 of your Dissertation Proposal as it stands now) (100 points) –

(Note that there are preliminary deadlines built into the syllabus for your use, i.e., citations list, sections of the review.)

TOTAL **200 points**

- 186-200 = A
- 180-185 = A-
- 175-179 = B+
- 166-174 = B
- 160-165 = B-
- 155-159 = C+
- 146-154 = C
- 140-145 = C -
- 120-139 = D
- 119   = F

Frequency Chart (15 points) –

C-F: As a capable consumer of research, the student selects appropriate articles and uses critical thinking to evaluate the content and methodology of each one. EAP 3, 4, 5, 7. Based on the model provided, you will choose three peer-reviewed journals relevant to your topic of interest and do a frequency search regarding the topic's discussion in those journals over the past 10 years (1996-2006). **(See Handout for template in Blackboard Course Documents)**

Literature Review Critique (20 points)

C-F: As a reflective decision-maker, the student demonstrates appropriate standards for evaluating and critiquing professional texts. EAP 3,4,7

One literature review published in a recent professional journal or book (2000-present), will be evaluated using the criteria developed in class drawing on the Galvan text as well as Boote and Beile. A paper copy of the article or PDF must be submitted along with the evaluation. Students will present their evaluations in class informally.

Sage Handbook Chapter Selections I, II, III: (20 points each x 3 = 60 points total)
Course Goal # 5: Articulate the trends and theoretical frameworks relevant to curriculum and instruction research. (EAP 3,4,7,8)

Describe or summarize the Concept or the contribution(s) of the Theorist/Researcher;
Explain how it relates to your scholarship/research interest and/or your dissertation proposal.

You are asked to select three chapters that appear to most closely represent your research and scholarly interests, primarily in your dissertation topic(s) but also as you prepare for your qualifying examinations. These three chapters will help you to situate your research in the larger domain of curriculum and instruction. This exercise will help you be able to articulate in your literature where your research 'fits' in the larger domain. It will further acquaint you with the types of research programs, the kinds of methods used and the researchers who are most prominent in or related to your interest area. Finally this set of tasks is intended to further prepare you for Qualifying Examinations in which you are asked to discuss Concepts, Theoretical Frameworks and Researchers in terms of how they relate to your own research points of view or arguments. Make this assignment work for you. Choose the three chapters carefully. We will

also help each other take into consideration what others have chosen. We will share these responses with the class, again, to help all of you prepare for Qualifying Examinations.

You will write an 'Analysis and Application Response' to the chapter to share on Blackboard as well as in class the night each is due. This Response is exactly what it says….an analysis of concepts, research programs, researchers' studies in the chapter followed by its application (or you might say relevance or relationship) to your study. In other words, where do you 'fit' into this scholarly landscape? Who are you most aligned with in terms of your research interests, questions, methodologies? You may find a study or two that is so compelling that you go TO that study in the literature and find out more. I encourage you to do this and to incorporate in your own literature review where appropriate. Note especially the methodologies used by researchers. If the Sage Handbook does not so note, you will need to go to the study to determine methods used to arrive at results, won't you?   These Responses should be 3 single-spaced pages.

Dissertation Proposal Literature Review (Chapter 2 Draft) (100 points)

Power Point (10 points)

C-F: As a reflective decision-maker, the student makes an appropriate selection of research articles and demonstrates critical thinking in synthesizing and evaluating the information. EAP 3.

Topic and subtopics/sections must be approved by the professor and based upon a <u>minimum of 50</u> research articles. The review must be accompanied by working research question(s) or hypothesis(es).

<u>Literature Review Criteria:</u>

See Galvan, pp. 111 – 115 for detail. We will also develop operational criteria, drawing on the Galvan, the Boote and Beile as well as our class discussions and sample literature reviews. Precise Grading Criteria weighted across 100 points will be presented by mid-semester based on these sources of information.

REFERENCES
References for this course are dissertation topic dependent and therefore individualized.

Journals for consideration include:
American Educational Research Journal
American Journal of Education
Arts Education Policy Review
Anthropology & Education
Australian Journal of Education
Comparative International Education
Early Childhood Research Quarterly
Curriculum Inquiry
Educational Technology Research and Development

Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis
Educational Researcher
Educational Research Journal
Florida Journal of Educational Research
International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education
Journal of Curriculum and Instruction
Journal of Educational Computing Research
Journal of Research on Computing in Education
Journal of Teacher Education
Journal of Science Education and Technology
Journal of Research and Development
Journal of Research in Childhood Education
Journal of Health Education
Journal of Research in Science Teaching
Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps
Journal of Educational Research
Journal of Learning Disabilities
Journal of Memory and Language
Journal of Curriculum and Supervision
Journal of Literacy Research
Journal of Elementary Science Education
Journal of Educational Measurement
Journal of Computing in Mathematics and Science Teaching
Learning Disability Research & Practice
Reading Psychology
Reading Research and Instruction
Reading Research Quarterly
Research in the Teaching of English
Teacher Education and Special Education
TESOL Quarterly
The Journal of Special Education
The Reading Teacher

TEACHING METHODOLOGIES

Lecture   Modeling   Research   Discussion   Presentations   Cooperative Groups
Electronic Communication including E-Mail; Blackboard (e.g., discussion board, digital dropbox; SafeAssign)
Audiovisual support (video, DVD, overhead projector, computer, Internet)

AUDIO/VISUAL TECHNOLOGY

- Use your FAU E-Mail Address (check frequently). Go to MyFAU to obtain your e-mail address.
- Blackboard site: Http://Blackboard.fau.edu, bb.fau.edu, or use link under Current students' tab.

- Research using FAU library, Internet browser, professional organizations, government websites
- Computers with word processing, presentation software, and high-speed Internet access are available in all campus computer and library labs. Files may be printed, saved, or e-mailed.

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (A.D.A.), students who require special accommodations due to a disability to properly execute coursework must register with the Office for Students with Disabilities (OSD) located in Boca - SU 133 (561-297-3880), in Davie - MOD I (954-236-1222), or in Jupiter SR 117 (561-799-8585) and follow all OSD procedures. The purpose of this office "is to provide reasonable accommodations to students with disabilities." Students who require assistance should notify the professor immediately by **submitting a letter from the Disabilities Office to your instructor** requesting your need of specific assistance. Without such letter, the instructor is not obligated to make any accommodations for students.

EXPECTATIONS

Attending Florida Atlantic University is a privilege. Professional conduct is expected and includes, but is not limited to, showing respect to colleagues and the instructor; being on time for class; completing assignments prior to entering class; preparing assignments with substantive content and accurate spelling, grammar, and mechanics; and displaying a positive interest in class.

Electronic Devices
Use of any electronic devices in the classroom should be limited to the content and activities taking place at that time. Inappropriate use of such devices may result in removal from the classroom, a reduction in your grade, or some other consequence, as determined by the professor.

Bringing Children or Guests to Class
Because of safety and liability issues, minor children are not permitted in class or in the hallways during class time. Other class visitors must be approved by instructor in advance.

Punctuality, Attendance, and Participation
- Students are expected to be on time and to remain for the duration of each class session. Since late arrivals and early departures are disruptive, they will be treated as absences and may affect your grade.
- Students are expected to attend all of their scheduled university classes and to satisfy all academic objectives as outlined by the instructor. The effect of absences upon grades is determined by the instructor, and the University reserves the right to deal at any time with individual cases of nonattendance. Attendance includes active involvement in all class sessions, class discussions, and class activities, as well as professional conduct in class. Points may be deducted for missing or failing to participate in some or all of a class session. Students are responsible for getting class notes/handouts from peers and making up any missed written assignments. Approval for making up any missed work and setting a new deadline must be granted by the instructor before work is submitted.

- Students are responsible for arranging to make up work missed because of legitimate class absence, such as illness, family emergencies, military obligation, court-imposed legal obligations, or participation in University-sponsored activities (such as athletic or scholastic team, musical and theatrical performances, and debate activities). It is the student's responsibility to give the instructor notice prior to any anticipated absence, and within a reasonable amount of time after an unanticipated absence, ordinarily by the next scheduled class meeting. Instructors must allow each student who is absent for a University-approved reason the opportunity to make up work missed without any reduction in the student's final course grade as a direct result of such absence.

Religious Accommodation
- In accordance with rules of the Florida Board of Education and Florida law, students have the right to reasonable accommodations from the University in order to observe religious practices and beliefs with regard to admissions, registration, class attendance, and the scheduling of examinations and work assignments.
- Students who wish to be excused from course work, class activities, or examinations must notify the instructor in advance of their intention to participate in religious observation and request an excused absence. The instructor will provide a reasonable opportunity to make up such excused absences.
- Any student who feels aggrieved regarding religious accommodations may present a grievance to the director of Equal Opportunity Programs. Any such grievances will follow Florida Atlantic University's established grievance procedure regarding alleged discrimination.

LiveText
Students in this course are required by the College of Education to have an active LiveText account to track mastery of programs skills, competencies and critical assignments and to meet program and college accreditation requirements. Students must have an account within: the first four (4) weeks of the fall or spring semester, within the first three (3) weeks of summer session, or after the first class of a fast track course. Students who do not have an active LiveText account may have an academic hold placed on their record. Information regarding account activation is provided on the College of Education website, http://coe.fau.edu/livetext.

Dropping the Course
In order to withdraw from a course, it is not sufficient to stop attending class or to inform the instructor of your intention to withdraw. In accordance with university policy, students wishing to withdraw from a course must do so formally through the Registrar's office. It is the students' responsibility to complete all forms. If this is not done, the instructor must assign a grade of F at the end of the semester. **FALL 2010**: "W" drop day is September 3; "F" Drop day is October 15.

Academic Honesty
Students at Florida Atlantic University are expected to maintain the highest ethical standards. Academic dishonesty, including cheating and plagiarism, is considered a serious breach of these ethical standards, because it interferes with the University mission to provide a high quality education in which no student enjoys an unfair advantage over any other. Academic dishonesty is also destructive of the University community, which is grounded in a system of mutual trust and

places high value on personal integrity and individual responsibility. Harsh penalties are associated with academic dishonesty, which may include an "F" on the assignment, an "F" in the course, or even removal from the degree program.

➢ Florida Atlantic University Regulation 4.001, "Honor Code, Academic Irregularities, and Student's Academic Grievances" is strictly adhered to in this course (http://www.fau.edu/regulations/chapter4/4.001_Honor_Code.pdf.). The regulation states: (1) Academic irregularities frustrate the efforts of the faculty and serious students to meet University goals. Since faculty, students and staff have a stake in these goals, the responsibility of all is to discourage academic irregularities by preventative measures and by insuring that appropriate action is taken when irregularities are discovered. Thus, FAU has an honor code requiring a faculty member, student or staff member to notify an Instructor when there is reason to believe an academic irregularity is occurring in a course. The Instructor's duty is to pursue any reasonable allegation, taking action, as described below, where appropriate.
(2) The following shall constitute academic irregularities:
   (a) The use of notes, books or assistance from or to other students while taking an examination or working on other assignments unless specifically authorized by the Instructor are defined as acts of cheating.
   (b) The presentation of words or ideas from any other source as one's own – an act defined as plagiarism.
   (c) Other activities which interfere with the educational mission within the classroom.

➢ In the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (APA), plagiarism is defined as:
   Plagiarism (Principle 6.22). Psychologists do not claim the words and ideas of another as their own; they give credit where credit is due. Quotation marks should be used to indicate the exact words of another. Each time you paraphrase another author (i.e., summarize a passage or rearrange the order of a sentence and change some of the words), you will need to credit the source in the text.

All sources used must be cited, referenced, and listed in the appropriate bibliography/materials list. Be especially careful about cutting and pasting text from websites. You may not do so without using quotation marks (or indented block quote for 40 words or more) for the text and citing the source. Be sparing in your use of online quotes.

N.

Appendix D

Ph.D. Programs at Other U.S. Universities

University	Total Credits beyond Bachelor	Total Minimum Credits Required	Number of Core Credits	Number of Research Credits	Number of Specializa-tion Credits	Disserta-tion Credits
FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY Ed.D. to Ph.D. in (Curriculum and Instruction)		**66**	**12 (4 courses)**	**15 (5 courses) (+ 2 intro courses if not taken before)**	**24**	**15**
Florida International University (Curriculum and Instruction) http://education.fiu.edu/graduate_programs/phded_ci.htm		93	15 (5 courses)	12 (4 courses; 2 other courses are equiv. to intro courses)		24
Florida State University (English Education) http://www.coe.fsu.edu/ste/Programs/English/doctoral.html	88		12-15 (4-5 courses)	12 (4 courses)		24
University of South Florida (Curriculum and Instruction) http://www.coedu.usf.edu/main/departments/ache/he/phd_cc.htm	83 - 85		9 (3 courses)	12 (4 courses)		24
University of Florida (Curriculum and Instruction) http://www.coe.ufl.edu/school/Programs/CTTE/program.html		66	18 (6 courses)	15 (5 courses)		12
University of Central Florida (Elementary Education) http://education.ucf.edu/phd/documents/PhDhandbook.pdf		72	21 (7 courses)	24 (7 courses)		24

University	Total Credits beyond Bachelor	Total Minimum Credits Required	Number of Core Credits	Number of Research Credits	Number of Specializa-tion Credits	Disserta-tion Credits
Arizona State University (Curriculum and Instruction) http://www.coe.uga.edu/esse/files/2010/04/PhD_Degree_in_Elementary_Education_Advanced_Educator_Preparat_on_Program.pdf		57	6 (2 courses)	18 (6 courses)	24	12
Michigan State University (Curriculum, Instruction, and Teacher Education) http://education.msu.edu/te/phd/Current-Students/Program-Requirements.asp		69	15 (5 courses)	12 (4 courses)	18	24
Pennsylvania State University (Curriculum and Instruction) http://www.ed.psu.edu/educ/c-and-i/graduate-programs/manuals/ci_phd_manual.pdf		62	2 (1 course)	12 (4 courses)	33	(Not taken for credit)
University of North Carolina (Culture, Curriculum, and Change) http://soe.unc.edu/academics/phd_ed_ccc/		68	6 (2 courses)	13 (4 courses)	36	12
University of Texas – Austin (Curriculum Studies) http://www.edb.utexas.edu/education/departments/ci/programs/cs/studentinfo/cstudents/grad/degrees/phd/		60	9 (3 courses)	12 (4 courses)	21 (15 credits have examples provided)	12

<div align="center">

O.

Appendix E

Selected Doctoral Student Positions, Publications, and Presentations

</div>

Sample Professional Positions

Amy Brown, Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction Graduate

> Assistant Professor in Elementary Mathematics Education
> Utah State University

Alison Dobrick, Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction Graduate

> Assistant Professor in Social Studies/Language Arts Education
> Director, William Paterson University Center for Holocaust and Genocide Studies
> Assistant Chairperson, Department of Elementary and Early Childhood Education
> William Paterson University

Megan Dolan, Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction Graduate

> Senior Research Scientist
> George Washington University
> Maryland Technical Assistance Coordinator for the Mid-Atlantic Equity Center

Ruth Doran, Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction Graduate

> Executive Director of the Guatemalan-Mayan Center
> Palm Beach County, FL

Gloria Pelaez, Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction Graduate

> Director of Accreditation for the School of Education
> University of Miami

Desmond Rodney, Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction Graduate

> Assistant Professor of Educational Technology
> Department of Multidisciplinary Studies
> Webster University

Cathy Smilan, Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction Graduate

> Assistant Professor in Art Education, and Director of Master of Art Education
> College of Visual and Performing Arts
> University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth

Chelneca K. Templeton, Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction Graduate

Associate Professor of Education
School of Education and Behavioral Studies
Palm Beach Atlantic University

Sample Publications

Note: The names of graduates or current students in the Ed.D. program are bolded.

Brown, S., & **Smilan, C**. (2007). Integrating art and music in the inclusive classroom. In S. Darling & M. LaRoque (Eds.), *Integrating curriculum within the inclusive K-3 classroom.* Boston: Allyn-Bacon.

Dobrick, A. (2009). Elementary social studies and the Internet. *Academic Exchange Quarterly, 13*(4), 17.

Doran, R. (2005). A critical examination of the use of fairy tale literature with pre-primary children in developmentally appropriate early childhood education and care programs. In *Questions of Quality* (pp. 62-69). Dublin, Ireland: Centre for Early Childhood Development and Education.

Kumar, D., Lapp, S., Marinaccio, P., & **Scarola, K.** (2008). Science literacy strategies anchored in nanotechnology. *School Science Review*, *89*, 63-73.

Newstreet, C. (2008). Paul Revere rides through high school government class: Teacher research and the power of discussion to motivate thinking. *The Social Studies, 99*(1), 9-12.

Smilan, C., & Keppel, P. (2007). Report of the MIENC Conference anthem for change: Music in education reform. *The NEC Journal for Learning Through Music.* Boston: NEC.

Wilson, C. L., Acker-Hocevar, M., Cruz-Janzen, M.; Schoon, P., Walker, D., & **Brown, A.** (2006). The proliferation of marginal research for dollars. *The International Journal of Learning*. 13(2), 85-93.

Sample Presentations

Bresnahan, T. (2008, September). Creating and managing literacy centers. What will the students do when you work with small groups? Presentation at the Florida Reading Association Annual Conference, Orlando, FL.

Bresnahan, T., Linville, M., & Steele. (2008, September). University and Lab School collaborate for action research. Presentation at the Florida Reading Association Annual Conference, Orlando, FL.

Linville, M., Barzey, C., **Bresnahan, T**., & Tolerton, L. (2006, April). Fostering school change: Using staff development as a vehicle for school improvement. Presentation at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Laboratory Schools, New York, NY.

McLaughlin, H. J., Linville, M., **Bresnahan, T**. & Steele, B. (2008, April). Seeing ourselves through the mist: Analyzing data to make sense of our teaching. Presentation at the Annual Meeting of the International Conference of Teacher Researchers, New York, NY.

Rodney, D. (2010). Do student-authored Wiki textbook projects support 21st Century learning outcomes? Roundtable presentation at the Annual Meeting of the Society for Information Technology in Education (SITE), San Diego, CA.

Rodney D., Kumar .D., & **Binder A.** (2008). Synchronized instructional video observation system (SIVOS): Analyzing TIMSS classroom interactions. Proceedings of the Association of Science Teacher Educators (ASTE) Annual Conference, St. Louis, MO.

Tamashiro, R., **Rodney, B.,** Benjamin, D., McKenna, E., Blaylock, W., & Petras, C. (2008). Systems design for professional development in technology: "It's more about the attitude, less about the methods." In K. McFerrin et al. (Eds.), Proceedings of the Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education International Annual Conference (pp. 5335-5339). Chesapeake, VA: AACE.

Templeton, C., & Lieberman, M. (2008, April). The impact of a museum-based science methods course on early childhood/elementary preservice teachers. Presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.

Appendix F

E-mail Responses of Department Chairs

Sent September 14, 2010
From: Barbara Ridener <bridener@fau.edu>
To: Harry James McLaughlin <jmclau17@fau.edu>
Subject: Re: Proposal to change the name of the Ed.D. to a Ph.D.

Jim,

I do not believe you need to ask for conflict with program changes. Only course. Anyway, Teaching and Learning does not have a conflict.

Barbara

From: Michael Brady <mbrady@fau.edu>
Date: Tue, 9 Nov 2010 15:29:26 -0500
To: Harry James McLaughlin <jmclau17@fau.edu>
Subject: RE: Revised Proposal for a Change of Name in the Doctoral Program

Your proposal continues the program that you folks have been offering for some time. It does not conflict with the courses or the program in the ESE Department. Good luck.

Michael P. Brady, PhD
Professor & Chair
Department of Exceptional Student Education
Florida Atlantic University
777 Glades Road
Boca Raton, FL 33431
(561) 297-3281
mbrady@fau.edu

Sent November 4, 2010
From: Sue Graves <sgraves@fau.edu>
To: Harry James McLaughlin <jmclau17@fau.edu>
Subject: RE: Revised Proposal for a Change of Name in the Doctoral Program

Dr. McLaughlin:
This change/proposal does not conflict with any of the ESHP curriculum. Good luck!

B. Sue Graves, Ed. D., Department Chair

Exercise Science and Health Promotion Department
Florida Atlantic University
777 Glades Road, Field House 11
Boca Raton, Florida 33431
561-297-2938 (main office)
561-297-2790 (office)
561-297-2839 (fax)
www.coe.fau.edu

From: Robert Shockley <SHOCKLEY@fau.edu>
Date: Tue, 9 Nov 2010 18:29:46 -0500
To: Harry James McLaughlin <jmclau17@fau.edu>
Subject: RE: Revised Proposal for a Change of Name in the Doctoral Program

Jim,

I have reviewed the revised proposal and compared this proposal with the concerns earlier expressed by the EDLRM department in earlier emails. I believe that your department is now submitting a more comprehensive proposal than before, but I do not see the other areas of EDLRM concern addressed, simply a more detailed justification for the original proposal. The major area of concern that deals with departmental conflict is in the area of electives. This issue impacts other departments when students are taking large numbers of specialization electives in other departments without pre-determined specialization areas in your program. Below is just one of many examples that I can share with you related to one of your students that is apparently trying to take a specialization in 'Higher Education Leadership".

> **From:** Audrita L. Drayton [mailto:adrayton@fau.edu] **Sent:** Thursday, November 04, 2010 6:53 AM **To:** Robert Shockley **Subject:**
>
> Back in March of 2010, you gave me permission to take the courses listed below in the email of March 26, 2010. I had registered for EDH 6065 002 CRN 81242 History and Philosophy of Higher Education (fall) and had to drop it because it conflicted with my required research course. Consequently, I need to take another EDL course. EDH 6065 is not being offered spring, 2011. I cannot take it in the fall of 2011 because there are two courses that I need to take to complete my degree that are only offered in the fall. As a result of the foregoing, would you be amenable to me taking EDH 6305 Improvement of Instruction in Colleges and EDA 5931 Student Development Theory? Both are being offered in spring, 2011. The courses would complete my area of specialization and allow me to take my last three classes in fall of 2011. Please give me permission to take both courses. I thank you, in advance, for your attention to the above matters.

This is only one of many student requests that I have received and an example of a student having an apparent specialization in Higher Education Leadership, where courses have to be taken to meet the requirement rather than specific courses targeted to the needs of the student. An

argument can be made here, and you have made it in your proposal, that these elective courses are targeted specifically to the dissertation and research needs of the student. The above student request does not seem to support this rationale. As a chair that deals with a number of CCEI student requests for permission to take EDL courses it would be beneficial to me and to the department if specific courses were pre-identified for your students to take as electives. Typically, our specialization courses are limited to EDL students in their area of specialization. I would also suggest that you consider pre-identified specialization areas. This would add some structure to your program and would allow you to collaborate and plan with other departments to minimize problems associated with this issue. You can always design a unique specialization approved by the chair when someone has needs that do not fit the pre-identified areas. Anyway, this is just a suggestion, and one that I shared with you earlier.

The other areas of departmental concerns expressed in my earlier e-mails relate to protocol issues that only the University governance structures can address and do not relate to questions of departmental conflict.

Robert Shockley, Chair
Department of Educational Leadership and Research Methodology
Florida Atlantic University
777 Glades Rd.
Boca Raton, FL 33431
561.297.3551
Shockley@fau.edu

Q.

Appendix G

**Responses to Feedback/Suggestions from College of Education
Graduate Programs Committee**

RE: Proposed Name Change from Ed.D. to Ph.D.

November 10, 2010

In this document we respond to the feedback and suggestions from the College of Education Graduate Programs Committee meeting that was held on September 29, 2010. We have made important revisions to the proposal, based on the verbal and written commentary from the GPC. We appreciate the feedback from the committee and look forward to consideration of the revised proposal on November 23, 2010. Below, we note some of the changes made in response to feedback:

• There is a new introductory section B, which describes our intent and rationale for the proposal (see p. 4 for this section). The former section F, on changing practices and perspectives of Ed.D. Programs, has been incorporated into this section.

• The Proposal Statement has been moved to section C, so that the reviewer can see it sooner (see p. 5).

• There is a new 7-page section F, "Overview of the Doctoral Program," to portray our program in depth (see pp. 9-16). This includes a new *Appendix E*, on "Selected Doctoral Student Positions, Publications, and Presentations."

• The conclusion, section J, was rewritten (see p. 24).

We have numbered the GPC feedback items below and offered our responses accordingly.

1. The proposal would be strengthened by clarifying the intent of the Ph.D. program (underlying reasons for change).

We added an introductory section B to identify immediately the purpose and the rationale for our research-intensive degree program and the appropriate name for the degree. We reiterated succinctly our purpose and rationale in the conclusion, section J.

2. The rationale and need for the Ph.D. needs to be more evident and strengthened. It was suggested, perhaps that a revised CCEI proposal incorporate the 2 page account of improvements designed to move the degree to a Ph.D. (Jim described to committee) to support both 1 & 2.

94

To give an "Overview of the Doctoral Program" in Section F, we did the following:

(1) Adapted information from our website and the Doctoral Student Handbook, and wrote new text, to develop a section on "Program Structure"

(2) Wrote a summary about "Comparisons with Other Ph.D. Programs" and included the referenced table as *Appendix D*.

(3) Wrote a section on "Attributes of the Doctoral Program" which includes text on "Program Purposes," a "Faculty Profile," "Curriculum," "Student Admission and Advising," "Communication with Students," and "Student and Program Assessment"

(4) Added *Appendix E*, which highlights "Selected Doctoral Student Positions, Publications, and Presentations."

3. The proposal needs to further clarify the rationale for the undesignated 27 elective credits. Specific elective courses recommended were not included in the proposal. While the committee appreciates the desire for this doctoral degree to include flexibility regarding electives, concern was expressed that 27 hours of unspecified electives was excessive. It was suggested that a rationale for flexibility as well as a need for structure to be delineated beyond advisor approval. It was also suggested that structure for the choice of courses (e.g. those within the discipline) be included for accreditation purposes and to provide enough information for reviewers at all levels.

Part of section F, "Overview of the Doctoral Program," deals with "Specialized Coursework." We present a rationale for our approach by noting the purpose and process of selecting Area of Specialization courses. We also make comparisons with doctoral programs closely related to Curriculum and Instruction, both within Florida and at five major national universities. Many quite highly rated universities in this country have Area of Specialization electives, which is evident in the chart (*Appendix D*). The Area of Specialization courses are intended to provide students with expertise and depth in a chosen area of concentration that will lead to a dissertation, such as mathematics, multicultural education, or writing, to name a few. As in our department, faculty in those universities must value both flexibility and focus, as students define their program of study in consultation with their advisors. Our policy for electives has always been that students may take electives only if: (a) they are approved by their program advisor; and (b) they have the permission of the instructor to enroll.

4. The budget and fiscal implications section needs to be strengthened. The CCEI needs to clarify the budget even if there is no perceived increase in departmental personnel or resources need to support the program. For example, it is assumed that students taking additional research courses would take the classes from the Department of Educational Leadership and Research Methodology and thus, additional resources will be required to meet the research course needs as identified. University resources may be affected, especially if students take elective coursework outside the College of Education.

Students will take an existing course (EDA 7416) and no new courses will be developed. We have spoken with a faculty member from Educational Leadership and Research Methodology who teaches this course, and have discussed the possibility that a second section of the course may be necessary during the transition period, to accommodate current students who wish to

change their Ed.D. to a Ph.D. Many of our students already take the course during their degree program because they are encouraged by their Program Advisor to do so; because of that, there should not be a large number of new students enrolling. We are willing to discuss with the department affected some solutions to any problems that arise regarding staffing or budgeting.

Any effect on enrollment in research course work in other university units will be minimal. We will not admit more than 10 students in each of two semesters, which is fewer students than in the past 4 years. Our hope is that students can take EDA 7416 as their advanced qualitative research course without additional budgetary resources applied. If the Department of Educational Leadership and Research Methodology finds that this is not feasible, for whatever reason, we will consider petitions from students to take a research course outside the COE to meet this program requirement.

5. The focus of the program needs to be clarified. Suggestion was made to clarify the focus of the program is primarily K-12 educators to address perceived duplication with adult learning and post secondary education.

Our doctoral program is centered on issues related to curriculum and instruction, a field where theory and research is broadly applied across diverse ages and educational contexts. Language limiting the doctoral program to grades "K-12" does not appear in the 2007 NCATE documents. Our focus is not on leadership, counseling, exceptional student education, or other departmental emphases within the College of Education. Most of the students in our doctoral program are in PreK-12 settings, but there are some community college instructors or people in community organizations who wish to learn more about curriculum and instruction in a content area such as science, mathematics, reading, or history, in order to improve their practice. We neither recruit from nor market our doctoral program to any community colleges or community organizations.

6. It was strongly recommended that the CCEI department consult the Department of Educational Leadership proposal as a guide for providing more specific information for the CCEI proposal as the requests from both departments are very similar (Ed.D. to Ph.D.). Educational Leadership Department was successful having their proposal approved (this was a suggestion not a requirement) and they began offering the Ph.D. and phased out the Ed.D. in 2005.

We have reviewed the new degree program proposal written by the Department of Educational Leadership. This was shared with CCEI by the Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership and Research Methodology at the COE Executive Committee meeting in July. We have also read the guidelines for course and program approval developed by the University GPC and approved in December 2008. Based on these documents, we believe that the proposal submitted by CCEI best fits the description of a "significant change to an existing degree program" described in the FAU GPC guidelines.

7. It was strongly recommended that the CCEI meet with Department of Educational Leadership and Research Methodology department regarding conflicts with existing programs (even though conflicts may exist with current Ed.D. program as currently offered. It was suggested that these issues be "worked out" between the two departments if the CCEI Ph.D. proposal is to successfully move forward.

The two chairs of the departments have remained in collegial contact in order to help clarify any concerns about the proposal, and have met 3 times to discuss the proposal. We welcome a meeting with members of the Department of Educational Leadership and Research Methodology after submitting this revised proposal, but before the Graduate Programs Committee meeting on November 23, 2010, if further discussion of this proposal is required.

8. If this proposal is resubmitted to the COE GPC, it is important that it be complete. Recommendations were offered regarding the order of the content and signature page. All departments should have their written review included at the end of the revised proposal, based on the exact proposal submitted to the COE GPC for their review and feedback. It is important that the revised application be complete and dated to avoid confusion with an earlier application when submitted to departments for their review.

We have responded to recommendations about the content and the signature page. We sent a request to COE Department Chairs to ascertain whether there is a conflict with existing courses in their programs. The Chairs' responses are included at the end of the revised proposal. Our previous proposal was dated on the cover page, and we have dated this one as well.

9. Concern remains regarding the CCEI decision to submit the Ph.D. proposal as a "name change" rather than as a new degree proposed. Concern was expressed that this is actually a new degree being proposed (Ph.D.) with plans to terminate the Ed.D. in CCEI upon approval of the new degree.

We are proposing a name change for the degree program, and we are not developing a new degree program. Our request involves no new courses to approve (EDA 7416 is an existing course), no new faculty position requests, and no funding for student scholarships. It is similar to a previous proposal made by the College of Nursing, when their Doctor of Nursing Science was changed to a Ph.D. in Nursing. They did not have a Ph.D. program before this change, as stated by the Dean, Dr. Anne Boykin.

Decisions about the best approval process for proposals such as this one are made at the higher administrative levels of FAU. We have, as the proposal discusses, met with the College of Education Dean, the University Interim Provost, and the Graduate College Dean, and have followed their recommendations accordingly.